VOLUME XXXVII No. 2

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL CARDOZO PAUL KINIERY ROBERT F. McNAMARA
WILLIAM L. DAVIS THOMAS T. McAVOY JOSEPH N. MOODY

Table of Contents

JULY, 1951

ARTICLES

Peter C. Yorke and the A.P.A. in San Francisco
Joseph S. Busher 129

Benedict XV, Wilson, Michaelis, and German Socialism
John L. Snell 151

BOOK REVIEWS 179

NOTES AND COMMENTS 227

BRIEF NOTICES 235

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 244

BOOKS RECEIVED 251

BOOK REVIEWS

White Magic. An Introduction to the Folklore of Christian Legend. (C. Grant Loomis). MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE 179

The Other World According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature. (Howard Rollin Patch). SISTER MARY JEROME KISHPAUGH 180

Eleanor of Aquitaine. (Curtis Howe Walker). JAMES A. CORBETT 182

Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings. (Amy Kelly). ANNA T. SHEEDY 183

Nationalism and Internationalism. (Edward Meade Earle). EDWARD J. GOODMAN 184

Oesterreichische Geschichtschreibung in der Barockzeit (1620-1740). (Anna Coreth). FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI 185

The Jacobite Movement. The First Phase, 1688-1716. (Sir Charles Petrie). CLARENCE J. RYAN 187

The Quest for Security, 1715-1740. (Penfield Roberts). A. PAUL LEVACK 188

Anglophobia in France, 1763-1789. (Frances Acomb). PAUL L. LOCHER.. 189

British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century: Policies and Speeches. (Joseph Hendershot Park). CHRISTOPHER HOWARD 190

The Neapolitan Revolution of 1820-1821. (George T. Romani). JOHN H. KENNEDY 191

Epistolario di Nino Bixio. Volume III *(1866-1870).* (Emilia Morelli). *Augusto de Liederkerke de Beaufort: Rapporti delle cose di Roma (1848-1849).* (Alberto M. Ghisalberti). HOWARD R. MARRARO 192

The Siberian Intervention. (John Albert White). WALDEMAR GURIAN ... 195

Lenin, a Biography. (David Shub). JOHN P. MONAGHAN 196

From a Political Diary. Russia, the Ukraine, and America, 1905-1945. (Arnold D. Margolin). OLGERD SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR 197

Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945: From the Archives of German Foreign Ministry. Volume III. *Germany and the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939.* CLARENCE C. WALTON 198

The World in Crisis. (J. Salwyn Schapiro). JAMES M. EAGAN..... 199

The Price of Union. (Herbert Agar). JAMES J. FLYNN 200

American Democracy and Natural Law. (Cornelia Geer Le Boutillier). CHARLES N. R. MCCOY 202

Appeals to the Privy Council from the American Plantations. (Joseph Henry Smith). JOHN T. FARRELL 203

Jonathan Edwards. (Perry Miller). EDWARD GARGAN 205

American History as Interpreted by German Historians from 1770 to 1815. (Eugene Edgar Doll). COLMAN J. BARRY 206

Lafayette Between the American and the French Revolution (1783-1789). (Louis Gottschalk). JOHN J. MENG 207

Bring Out Your Dead. The Great Plague of Yellow Fever in Philadelphia in 1793. (J. H. Powell). BARTHOLOMEW F. FAIR 208

Backwoods Utopias. The Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America: 1663-1829. (Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr.). AARON I. ABELL 209

John Wesley Jarvis, American Painter, 1780-1840, with a Checklist of His Works. (Harold E. Dickson). RICHARD J. STORR 210

The Yankee Exodus: An Account of Migration from New England. (Stewart H. Holbrook). JAMES J. GREEN 211

The New Stars: Life and Labor in Old Missouri. (Manie Kendley Morgan). SISTER M. EVANGELINE THOMAS 212

The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865. (Ellis Merton Coulter). VINCENT DEPAUL MCMURRY 214

Melville Weston Fuller. (Willard L. King). LEO A. ROVER 215

Agnes Repplier. Lady of Letters. (George Stewart Stokes). EMMETT M. WALSH 216

American Immigration Policy. A Reappraisal. (William S. Bernard, Carolyn Zeleny, Henry Miller). SISTER MARY GILBERT KELLY 217

The United States in a Chaotic World and The New Deal and World Affairs. (Allan Nevins). P. RAYMOND NIELSON 219

Union Policies in the Leather Industry. (Leo Cyril Brown, S.J.). PHILLIPS BRADLEY 220

Bartolomé de las Casas. (Lewis Hanke). ANTONINE S. TIBESAR 221

Sonora. A Description of the Province. (Ignaz Pfefferkorn, S.J.). SISTER MARY CRESCENTIA THORNTON 222

Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes. (Joseph H. L. Schlarman). W. EUGENE SHIELS 223

The Life of Joaquim Nabuco. (Carolina Nabuco). ROBERT J. WELCH 225

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XXXVII JULY, 1951 No. 2

PETER C. YORKE AND THE A.P.A. IN SAN FRANCISCO

By

Joseph S. Brusher*

Although religious liberty has been a tradition of the United States, there has been more than one attempt to destroy or diminish that liberty.[1] The Native American movement of the 1830's and the Know-Nothing movement of the 1850's even produced mob violence. A later movement similar to these but not productive of as much violence was that fostered by the American Protective Association. This organization was founded by Henry Bowers at Clinton, Iowa, in 1887, but it did not make its presence felt until the next decade. It reached its peak in 1894 and then declined until the years after the Spanish-American War consigned it to practical oblivion. But before its failure the A.P.A. managed to arouse a great deal of bitterness.[2]

To understand the background of the fight we must realize that in treating the A.P.A. one is dealing not with respectable Protestantism, but with a lunatic fringe of Protestantism, with an organization denounced in no uncertain terms by such eminent Protestants as the

* Father Brusher, S.J., is assistant professor of history in Loyola University of Los Angeles.

[1] Peter C. Yorke, *Ghosts of Bigotry* (San Francisco, 1913), p. 271; Ray A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade* (New York, 1938), pp. 75, 220.

[2] *Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1907), I, 426; *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History* (New York, 1902), I, 123-124; Michael Williams, *The Shadow of the Pope* (New York, 1932), chapter VI; Humphrey J. Desmond, *The A.P.A. Movement* (Washington, 1921), a brief, popular account.

Reverends Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbot, and Elbert Hubbard.[3] A specimen of A.P.A. achievement was the circulation of a bogus encyclical of Leo XIII, the most lurid part of which read ". . . as we shall exonerate them (the Catholics) from all engagements and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of Our Lord 1893 it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found in the jurisdiction of the United States of America."[4] It may sound incredible in our day but let Washington Gladden give the reactions of the credulous at that time: "A Protestant minister of Columbus, Ohio, stated not long ago in an ecclesiastical assembly that he had purchased a Winchester rifle to defend himself against the Romanists."[5] Elbert Hubbard was himself more detailed:

> . . . And so in many towns and villages as I journeyed I found this quaking fear. In many places men were arming themselves with Winchester rifles; many preachers never spoke in public without fanning the flame; A.P.A. lodges were rapidly initiating new members, and lurid literature which was being vomited forth from presses in Louisville, Chicago, Omaha and Kansas City was being sent out broadcast . . . The A.P.A. seeks to spread hate. It thrives by fear, and its only weapon is untruth.[6]

The A.P.A. struggle west of the Rockies centered in San Francisco. There in the picturesque city celebrated by Frank Norris and Jack London a fight raged which surpasses in interest any Embarcadero brawl or Chinatown tong war, a fight which had wide significance and some historical importance, the fight between Father Yorke and the A.P.A. It could well be viewed as a case study of a fight against bigotry, and bigotry was surprisingly strong at that time in the city. San Francisco, gay, cosmopolitan, debonair, might have been expected to be easy-going and good natured, but during the 1890's a wave of bigotry arose to afflict this usually tolerant city. Its Protestant pulpits rang with denunciations of Rome and its Metropolitan Temple echoed to vile and cowardly attacks on priests and nuns. The A.P.A. had, indeed, invaded San Francisco.

The Catholics, however, were not without a champion. In Peter C.

[3] *The Monitor* (San Francisco), August 25, 1894.

[4] *The Call* (San Francisco), February 16, 1896.

[5] "The Anti-Catholic Crusade," *Century Magazine,* XLVII (March, 1894), 792.

[6] "A New Disease," *The Arena,* X (June, 1894), 79-80, quoted by Yorke in the *Call,* February 16, 1896.

Yorke, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of San Francisco and editor of the *Monitor*, the bigots found an opponent who could answer the clumsy billingsgate of the A.P.A. orators with words that scorched and stung; and brilliant logic and wide erudition made short work of any attack above the level of a fishwives' quarrel. This young priest bore single-handed the brunt of the A.P.A. attacks in San Francisco, met and routed their champions in controversy, and ruthlessly tore the veil from the devious methods by which these "patriots" strove to protect America.

The Reverend Peter C. Yorke was born in Galway, Ireland, on August 15, 1864. He had begun his theological studies at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, but completed them at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, and in 1887 he was ordained by Cardinal Gibbons. Sent to the newly-founded Catholic University of America at Washington in 1889, he obtained the degree of S.T.L. in 1891. By 1894 when the A.P.A. question first became acute in San Francisco he had already won a record for brilliant achievement. He had been instrumental in organizing the League of the Cross, a temperance organization which enjoyed great popularity in the San Francisco Bay area. That he had already made his mark in the field of Catholic education, we may judge from the fact that to him was entrusted the preparation of the San Francisco Catholic school exhibit for the Chicago World's Fair.[7]

A task at once more stern and difficult now presented itself. In 1894 Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan protested the use in the public schools of Ginn and Company's publication, *Outlines of Medieval and Modern History* by Philip V. Meyers.[8] This proved to be the spark that set off an explosion of religious strife and bitterness which racked the city for several years. The archbishop's protest was regarded as a threat to the public schools. The Reverend John Q. A. Henry of the First Baptist Church wrote a pamphlet characteristically entitled *Rome's Red Hand in the Public Schools*.[9] In this pamphlet he quoted Pope Pius IX as having said: "The Romish Church has a right to interfere with the discipline of the public schools and the choice of teachers." In it likewise appeared that hardy perennial of bigotry, the so-called Jesuit Oath. Henry's attack did not go un-

[7] *The Leader* (San Francisco), April 11, 1925.
[8] *The Monitor* (San Francisco), April 7, 1894.
[9] *Ibid.*

answered. Yorke, now in charge of the *Monitor*, the official organ of the archdiocese, replied by calling the minister a liar and a forger. He roundly accused Ginn and Company of being at the bottom of the attack and claimed that Henry's diatribe should be called: "A defence of Ginn's hand in the public pocket." He challenged Henry to prove that Pius IX had really made the statement quoted and he offered to post $500 in the hand of any reputable citizen if the minister would do likewise. If Henry should prove that the challenged statement was a correct quotation, Father Yorke's $500 would go to the benefit of the unemployed, but should Henry fail to establish the authenticity of the statement, his $500 would be forfeited to the same charity. For the so-called Jesuit Oath the same challenge was offered. If the Reverend Mr. Henry should refuse to accept the challenge Yorke promised to go on calling him a liar and a forger. Henry did refuse, and Yorke was as good as his word.[10]

The Reverend Charles O. Brown, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, likewise viewed with alarm Rome's threat to the public schools.[11] In masterly fashion Yorke pointed out that sectarianism in the public schools was forbidden by the state constitution.[12] In rebuttal to this Brown protested that Catholics refused to accept facts and that sectarianism did not consist in teaching the facts of history.[13] Yorke aptly retorted that though facts might be neutral, interpretation of facts might be sectarian. For instance, Meyers stated that Protestantism was a revival of primitive Christianity.[14] "Now that statement is thoroughly sectarian," said the editor of the *Monitor*. And he continued: "It is not a statement of fact, it is a theory drawn from a number of facts. Catholics draw the very opposite theory. One single sectarian statement unfits the book for use in the public schools."[15]

The archbishop's protest, reasonable though it was, for Meyers' history was definitely Protestant,[16] met with failure. The school

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.*, April 30, 1894; cf. San Francisco *Chronicle*, April 16, 1894; San Francisco *Examiner*, April 30, 1894.

[12] *Constitution of the State of California*, Article IX, section 8.

[13] *The Monitor*, April 21, 1894.

[14] Philip Van Ness Meyers, *Outlines of Medieval and Modern History* (Boston, 1894), p. 364.

[15] W. F. Randall, *Mistakes and Misstatements of Meyers* (Columbia, 1903).

[16] *The Monitor*, April 21, 1894.

board compromised by permitting teachers to omit objectionable passages.[17] Father Yorke expressed his amazement and contempt for such pussyfooting when he wrote:

> The order of the school board is such an evidence of folly that we hardly believed our eyes when we read it. In giving teachers power to omit objectionable passages, the directors admitted the presence of such passages. Now the law distinctly forbids the use of books containing such passages. It not only forbids the sectarian teaching, it forbids the use of books containing sectarian teaching. The resolution is evidently an attempt to escape doing what is the board's plain duty. The book is either sectarian or it is not. There can be no mean. If it is sectarian then it has no place in the school department, if it is not sectarian then the board should say so.[18]

This was clear and forceful reasoning, yet Meyers' textbook continued in use in the public schools of San Francisco. Yorke himself claimed that from the moment that the school board dared not accede to Archbishop Riordan's request, the A.P.A. grew and waxed strong.[19] In this preliminary skirmish with the forces of bigotry Peter Yorke had displayed the keen logic, the biting sarcasm, and the mastery of language which characterized his polemical writings and made him the scourge and despair of the A.P.A.

The struggle over Meyers' *History* marked the beginning of a wave of bigotry which kept Yorke busy during the next two years. Week after week one preacher after another attacked the Catholic Church. From his pulpit at Simpson Memorial Methodist Church, Dr. A. C. Hirst[20] blasted away at the Pope while the Reverend Elbert R. Dille, who during this period was called to the Central Methodist Church, declaimed against Catholic intolerance.[21] The Reverend John Q. A. Henry as the herald of the A.P.A., used the platform of Metropolitan Hall to tickle the ears of eager audiences with details of convent life as suggestive as they were false.[22] Many of these attacks were printed in the secular papers,[23] whereas Father Yorke as yet confined him-

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] San Francisco *Examiner*, September 29, 1896.

[20] *The Monitor*, May 19, May 26, 1894.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*, May 5, 1894; cf. San Francisco *Star* quoted in the *Monitor*, October 27, 1894; *The Monitor*, August 25, 1894.

[23] San Francisco *Chronicle*, April 16, 1894.

self to the columns of the *Monitor* where week after week he refuted the attacks of the ministers.

As we have already remarked, responsible Protestant ministers had attacked the A.P.A. in other parts of the country. One is, however, amazed at the extent of the bigotry which flourished among the San Francisco preachers. Up to the middle of 1894 no Protestant minister had protested against the unjust charges of the A.P.A.,[24] nor has the writer found evidence of any ever doing so. The California Baptists actually supported Henry, one of the city's worst offenders against tolerance and decency.[25] The Methodists also endorsed the A.P.A.,[26] while forty assorted ministers of San Francisco and Oakland stamped the association with their approval.[27] Even the Episcopalians were no exception. The Reverend Dr. Robert C. Foute, Rector of Grace Cathedral, was chaplain of Council 35 A.P.A., the president of which had been run out of Monmouth Normal School for immorality.[28]

A shining exception to this bigotry was the devotion to American principles of toleration exhibited by the San Francisco Jews. Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger of Temple Emanu El, in the opinion of Yorke, ". . . has earned for himself the distinction of being the only non-Catholic clergyman who has had the courage to denounce in public the unrighteous and un-American aims of the A.P.A. This is but what we expected from the Hebrew Community and Temple Emanu El."[29] Moreover, Rabbis M. Friedlander, Mayer Levy, and Jacob Nieto introduced Yorke at various lectures during his stirring campaign against the A.P.A. in the latter part of 1896.[30]

Coincident with the controversy over Meyers' history text there appeared in San Francisco ex-priest Slattery to lecture under A.P.A. auspices.[31] Father Yorke promptly published in the *Monitor* infor-

[24] *The Monitor*, July 7, 1894.
[25] *The Monitor*, October 20, 1894.
[26] *Ibid.*, October 6, 1894.
[27] *Ibid.*, October 27, 1894.
[28] *Ibid.*, September 22, 1894.
[29] *Ibid.*, November 3, 1894.
[30] San Francisco *Examiner*, July 21, August 25, September 1, 1896.
[31] *Ibid.*, April 2, 1894. Through the courtesy of the Reverend Ralph Hunt, intimate friend and successor of Father Yorke as pastor of St. Peter's Church, San Francisco, the writer has seen a handbill advertising the lectures of ex-priest Slattery. Though the connotation is sad the dodger was in itself amusing.

mation he had obtained from Ireland which explained Slattery's defection.[32] Four times the poor wretch had been removed from the mission on account of drink. To discredit himself more thoroughly, Slattery when refused further drinks in a San José eating place, made such a nuisance of himself that he had to be ejected.[33]

The activity of the A.P.A. was not confined to harsh words and insulting speeches. The Association's oath called for a boycott of Catholics. It read: "I do most solemnly swear . . . that I will not employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if I can secure the services of a Protestant."[34] Nor did the San Francisco members intend to let this oath remain a dead letter. On August 1, 1894, at a meeting of Council No. 9 the state advisory board ordered the members to withdraw their patronage from O'Connor, Moffat and Company, J. J. O'Brien and Company, Lundy Furniture Company, Nolan Brothers, Duffy and Company, and the Curtin Dry Goods Company.[35] The same boycott list was read on the following night at Council No. 6, also called the Mission Benevolent Association.[36] On September 5 at a meeting of Council No. 15, the aristocratic lodge of the city, Mr. Scott, the superintendent of the Union Iron Works, stated that no Roman Catholic would receive employment from him in the future where a Protestant could be secured.[37] A member of the school board named Henderson was rebuked at a meeting of Council No. 1 for voting for a Catholic as vice-principal of a public school.[38] These few examples reveal the really dangerous aspect of A.P.Aism, the spirit of intolerance which, not satisfied with words, sought to persecute the detested religion by whatever means possible.

Father Yorke believed, as did Archbishop John Hughes of New

Ladies and Gentlemen are admitted to Sunday's Lecture, while Monday Mrs. Slattery will address 'Ladies' only on "Secrets of Nuns and the Confessional Exposed." Tuesday the ex-priest himself will hold forth to an exclusively male audience on "Secrets and Mysteries of the Romish Confessional." "Half of your life is gone if you fail to hear Slattery," the handbill warned.

[32] *The Monitor,* April 7, 1894.

[33] *Ibid.,* April 28, 1894. For Slattery cf. *The Works of Brann the Iconoclast* (New York, 1919), Volume XII.

[34] *The Monitor,* April 7, 1894.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] *Ibid.*

[38] San Francisco *Examiner,* September 1, 1896.

York in an earlier day, that active persecution should be actively fought. He published A.P.A. attempts at boycott in the *Monitor* and ran a business directory of A.P.A. members and sympathizers which an enterprising gentleman named Carter had arranged.[39] In the *Monitor* also appeared week by week lists of A.P.A. members in the bay region communities.[40] These measures brought a number of speedy and sometimes amusing repudiations both of the A.P.A. and of Carter's directory.[41]

As election day drew near in 1894, the A.P.A. made strenuous efforts to prove its political strength. Lists of favored candidates both for state and city tickets were published by the lodges.[42] These Father Yorke printed in the *Monitor* and with them a list of all candidates who actually were members of the A.P.A.[43] That the liberals of San Francisco should defeat these men was the continual burden of the *Monitor* editorials from this time until the election. To meet the challenge of organized bigotry, Yorke fostered the organization of the American Liberal League[44] which was a non-sectarian, non-partisan group whose members believed in the constitutional right of American citizens to religious liberty. Yorke claimed that the American Liberal League was, "the natural result of the exposure of the A.P.A. in San Francisco in the *Monitor*."[45]

The next step was to urge all candidates who, although not actually members of the A.P.A. had been endorsed by it, to repudiate this endorsement. If they did not, they could only be regarded as friendly to the party of bigotry and proscription and should, therefore, be defeated at all costs.[46] It proved to be good strategy, for the A.P.A., as events throughout the nation were to show, needed political patronage to exist.[47] Yorke's policy was to make this impossible by securing the defeat of every candidate favorable to the A.P.A. Some of the candidates did repudiate the A.P.A. endorsement. In the same issue of the *Monitor* which printed the lists of endorsed candidates, H. M.

[39] *The Monitor*, September 29, 1894.
[40] *Ibid.*, September 29, October 6, 13, 20, 1894.
[41] *Ibid.*, October 13, 27, 1894.
[42] *Ibid.*, November 3, 1894.
[43] *Ibid.*
[44] *Ibid.*, October 18, 1894.
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid.*
[47] Cf. *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*, I, 123-124.

La Rue, candidate for railroad commissioner, emphatically repudiated the A.P.A.[48] In the issue of November 5 appeared a letter signed by ten endorsees of the A.P.A. disclaiming the organization and its aims.[49] One important candidate endorsed by the A.P.A. was Adolph Sutro, the popular choice for mayor. In answer to Yorke's appeal Sutro replied that he declined to refuse votes which had been offered to him unsolicited.[50]

Father Yorke appealed to all classes to join in the crusade against bigotry. On the feast of Yom Kippur he cited the example of Jews in the eastern United States who had spoken out strongly against the A.P.A. in order to encourage the Jews of San Francisco to do likewise.[51] As we have seen, this appeal did not fall on deaf ears. In his appeal to the workers Yorke was especially earnest.[52] Again and again he urged the forces of labor to recognize the fact that at bottom the A.P.A. was anti-labor as well as anti-Catholic. " 'I will not enter into an agreement with a Roman Catholic to strike,' " he wrote. "This is a part of the A.P.A. oath. In whose smithy," asked Yorke, "was it forged, Monopoly's or the devil's?"[53]

To understand the force of the priest's appeals to the workers one must remember that it was the California of the 1890's when the Southern Pacific Railroad was king. The clever article reprint from the *Star* in the *Monitor* for October 27 presumed this background. If John Dunn, a loyal Catholic, were running against Collis P. Huntington, a non-Catholic, every A.P.A., said the editor of the *Monitor,* would be compelled to vote for the infamous Huntington.[54] Shortly before the election Father Yorke made a stirring appeal to the non-Catholics of San Francisco to remember the many years in which peace and concord had reigned between Catholic and non-Catholic in the city.[55] And, needless to say, throughout the campaign he was insistent on the need of Catholics voting, and voting correctly.

[48] *The Monitor,* November 3, 1894.
[49] *Ibid.,* November 5, 1894.
[50] *Ibid.*
[51] *Ibid.,* October 18, 1894.
[52] *Ibid.,* October 20, November 3, 5, 1894.
[53] *Ibid.,* November 5, 1894. As evidence that Peter C. Yorke fought for union labor in San Francisco cf. Bernard C. Cronin, *Father Yorke and the Labor Movement in San Francisco, 1900-1910* (Washington, 1943).
[54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.,* October 20, 1894.

The election proved to be a signal victory for Father Yorke and a severe set-back to the A.P.A. Every candidate who had repudiated the A.P.A. endorsement had been elected.[56] Judge James V. Coffey, a Catholic and a special object of the A.P.A. hatred, won by a magnificent majority.[57] Sutro, it is true, was elected mayor, but as he was the strong popular choice, this hardly reflected any glory on the brethren.[58] The only plum salvaged by the A.P.A. was the election of Charles F. Curry, the choice of the lodges for county clerk.[59] Curry's victory was important because he was able to give some patronage, and he appeared again as a leader of the A.P.A. forces in the election of 1896.

For about a year after the election of 1894 the A.P.A. issue was more or less dormant in San Francisco. But the peace was broken when the Reverend Donald M. Ross, pastor of the Lebanon Presbyterian Church, in the course of a lecture at Metropolitan Hall on November 24, 1895, quoted as Catholic doctrine taken from Catholic sources the following four statements: "1. The Romish Church has a right to exercise its authority without any limit set to it by the civil powers; 2. The Pope and the priests ought to have dominion over temporal affairs; 3. The Roman Church and her ecclesiastics have a right to immunity from civil law; 4. In case of conflict between ecclesiastical and civil powers, the ecclesiastical ought to prevail."[60] These statements were published in the *Chronicle* on November 25. The lecture might have been ignored, but the publicity given to such statements in a daily paper rendered it imperative that they be refuted. Father Yorke, once more assuming the role of defender of the faith, offered $100 to any charity the Reverend Mr. Ross would name if he could prove to the satisfaction of three non-Catholic lawyers that the above were statements of Catholic teaching.[61] The *Chronicle* refused to print this challenge,[62] but its rival, the *Examiner,* made it known.[63]

[56] *Ibid.,* November 10, 1894.
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] *Ibid.*
[59] *Ibid.*
[60] San Francisco *Examiner,* November 28, 1895.
[61] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 2, 1895.
[62] *Ibid.*
[63] San Francisco *Examiner,* Nov. 28, 1895.

Ross refused to "bet," as he termed it, with Yorke but he offered to debate with him before three or five judges in the Mechanics' Pavilion.[64] But Yorke insisted on the forfeit: "If the Reverend Donald M. Ross and his associates are not in the business of distributing forgeries," he said, "he can benefit some worthy cause to the extent of $100."[65] But Ross did not seem interested in benefiting any worthy cause as he steadfastly refused to imperil any of his funds in the venture and he claimed that such a proposition was "horsey" and unbecoming.[66] An interchange of several letters brought no result, as Yorke refused to be drawn into a debate, but rather kept on insisting that Ross prove that he took the disputed statements from Catholic sources. Meanwhile the minister continued to haggle about the forfeit. It seemed likely that the matter would end there when George A. Hubbell, editor of the *American Patriot,* San Francisco A.P.A. organ, offered to post the forfeit.[67] This was acceptable to Yorke, but he did not lose the opportunity to twit Ross for allowing another to do for him what he was too squeamish to do for himself.[68]

The plan was for each disputant to choose a judge, and the two thus chosen were then to select a third.[69] Yorke promptly selected Mr. W. W. Foote, a non-Catholic attorney.[70] Foote accepted when told all that was required of him was to judge whether or not the four statements came from Catholic sources.[71] The Reverend Mr. Ross meanwhile voiced fears of personal violence,[72] to which Yorke retorted that as for a year and a half, Catholics had been vilified without any A.P.A. suffering bodily harm, Ross need have no fears.[73]

The minister soon showed how little confidence he had in his case, for after a brief delay he appointed Henry W. Quitzow as his judge.[74] Quitzow was a prominent figure in anti-Catholic circles who only a few nights before at an A.P.A. gathering had said: "The enemy are now under the searchlight of the A.P.A. The light is turned on the

[64] *Ibid.*
[65] *Ibid.*, November 31, 1895.
[66] *The Call,* December 2, 1895.
[67] *Ibid.*, December 5, 1895.
[68] *Ibid.*, December 6, 1895.
[69] *Ibid.*, December 2, 1895.
[70] San Francisco *Examiner,* December 8, 1895.
[71] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 10, 1895.
[72] *Ibid.*, December 7, 1895.
[73] San Francisco *Examiner,* December 8, 1895.
[74] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 10, 1895.

ST. MARY OF THE SPRINGS
COLLEGE LIBRARY

doctrines they have taught in this controversy between Reverend Donald M. Ross and Fr. Peter C. Yorke."[75] Yorke, in fact, had only finished excoriating Quitzow for his attack in Metropolitan Temple when the appointment was announced.[76] With pompous gravity, comical under the circumstances, Quitzow announced that since he was judge in the dispute, he would ignore Yorke's animadversions.[77] Foote was disgusted and expressed doubt about serving with such a man.[78] So general, however, was the disgust[79] that a few days later Quitzow withdrew.[80] The next choice of Ross was equally unfortunate. Major Edwin A. Sherman, a confirmed anti-Catholic bigot, was a lawyer who devoted more time to Masonic work than to the bar.[81] He was engaged only a few months before in printing the libellous *Monita Secreta* in the *American Patriot*[82] and, according to the *Monitor,* he was a grand eagle of the A.P.A.[83]

Ross published his last letter of the year on December 22, detailing a plan for a mass meeting at Mechanics' Pavilion in the second week of February.[84] After this he retired to winter quarters to prepare his proof that the challenged statements were from Catholic sources. Meanwhile Father Yorke was allowed no leisure, for by now the ministers of San Francisco were in full cry and there ensued a period of brief and unusually bitter controversy between Yorke and various members of the San Francisco Protestant ministry and of the A.P.A.

In the meantime the Ross controversy was proving a fiasco. As was to be expected, Mr. Foote and Major Sherman could not agree on a third judge and the former finally withdrew.[85] Ross, however, determined to make the most of the affair and announced that he

[75] *Ibid.,* December 9, 1895.
[76] *Ibid.,* December 10, 1895.
[77] *Ibid.,* December 11, 1895.
[78] *Ibid.,* December 12, 1895.
[79] *Ibid.,* December 14, 1895.
[80] *Ibid.*
[81] *Ibid.,* December 15, 1895. For Sherman's attitude toward the Church cf. Arthur Preuss, *American Freemasonry* (St. Louis, 1908), p. 276.
[82] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 20 quoting the *Monitor,* March 16, 1895.
[83] *Ibid.*
[84] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 22, 1895.
[85] San Francisco *Examiner,* February 25, 1896.

would prove that the four challenged statements were from Catholic sources in a series of four lectures at the Mechanics' Pavilion during the last week of February, 1896.[86] Peter Yorke took notice of this only in so far as to warn the people that there would be no debate and that Ross' meeting was a "humbug at two-bits a humbug." He promised to answer anything worthy of rebuttal in the papers.[87]

The Reverend Mr. Ross held his first meeting in Mechanics' Pavilion on February 24, 1896. Mr. George A. Hubbell, editor of the local A.P.A. journal, came before the small crowd of 500 and called solemnly three times for Mr. Foote. This was but mummery, as Foote had clearly evinced his intention of having nothing to do with the Ross show. Major Sherman, the judge of Ross' choice, then arose and declared that he would not believe a priest on oath. After these preliminaries Ross attempted to establish the authenticity of the fourth of the challenged statements.[88] On the three following nights he dealt with the other statements.[89] At the end Sherman declared that Ross had proved that the four statements were from Catholic sources.[90]

Had he? It is doubtful whether many who would read the arguments of Reverend Mr. Ross and the refutations of Father Yorke would think so. Indeed, Ross must have realized that he was defending a lost cause, for his refusal to appoint an impartial judge certainly indicated a lack of confidence in his cause. His most plausible argument consisted in quotations from the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX and various other Catholic documents, but these quotations Yorke had no difficulty in proving garbled or misinterpreted. After each lecture the priest dashed off hurried rebuttals for the next day's paper which[91] he followed up with longer refutations a few days later.[92]

The Reverend Mr. Ross was the first of a regiment of preachers

[86] *The Call* (San Francisco), February 24, 1896. Through the courtesy of the late Reverend Ralph Hunt the writer possesses a handbill put out by the A.P.A. advertising the affair.

[87] *Ibid.*

[88] San Francisco *Examiner*, February 25, 1896.

[89] *The Call* (San Francisco), February 28, 1896. San Francisco *Examiner*, February 27, 28, 1896.

[90] San Francisco *Examiner*, February 28, 1896.

[91] *Ibid.*, February 25; *The Call* (San Francisco), February 26; San Francisco *Examiner*, February 27, 1896.

[92] *The Call* (San Francisco), March 4, 5, 6, 1896.

and A.P.A. members to engage Peter Yorke in public controversy. Between December, 1895, and March, 1896, Case, Wendte, Hubbell, Bovard, Morgan, Brewer, and Hudelson all tilted with the Catholic champion. Later controversies found John Q. A. Henry back in the fray along with Elbert R. Dille and J. M. Alexander, but it would prove tedious to give more than the high points of these controversies.

The Yorke-Wendte controversy, the most dignified and the most interesting from a theological point of view, began when the *Examiner* of January 9, 1896, carried a letter from the Reverend Charles W. Wendte, D.D., Unitarian Minister of Oakland, deprecating the current controversies raging in the press between Yorke and various ministers. Dr. Wendte offered to debate with Father Yorke in a dignified manner the following topics: The Primacy of Peter; the possibility of being a good Catholic and a good American; and the superiority of Protestantism over Catholicism as evidenced by the contrast between Protestant and Catholic countries.[93] The controversy lasted until February 12 when Mr. Wendte withdrew from the discussion. The debate had, in fact, treated only the first and second questions. Yorke drew up an able statement of the arguments for St. Peter's primacy, and the most masterly part of the whole affair was the summing up by the editor of the *Monitor* of his own and Wendte's arguments.[94]

The other controversies were more sporadic and for the most part consisted of a vigorous defense by Yorke against the really outrageous attacks by assorted and irresponsible bigots. When these attacks on the Catholic Church were not downright abuse and vilification they were characterized by an unscrupulous juggling of quotations from Catholic sources. The controversy with the Reverend Westwood W. Case which ran from December 9, 1895, to January 1, 1896,[95] furnished an example of A.P.A. mentality and morality as enlightening as it is now amusing. In a lecture at Metropolitan Temple, Case quoted various moral problems from Gury's *Compendium of Moral Theology*. One was "Are ecclesiastics obliged to obey the civil law?

[93] San Francisco *Examiner*, January 9, 1896, and *The Yorke-Wendte Discussion* (San Francisco, 1896).

[94] San Francisco *Examiner*, February 9, 13, 1896.

[95] *The Call* (San Francisco), December 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 1895; January 1, 1896.

No, not the laws which are contrary to their sacred canons."[96] Yorke immediately sent a copy of Gury's work to the office of the San Francisco *Call* which had replied "Yes" instead of "No" in answer to the above question.[97] But that did not daunt the valiant Case. He claimed that his copy of Gury gave "No" as the answer, and that Father Yorke's copy merely proved that the Romanists had two versions, one for the priests and the other for public view.[98] When Yorke challenged him to produce his copy with the negative answer in it,[99] Case replied that it was absurd to expect him to bring his whole library down to the *Call* office![100]

The Yorke-Hubbell controversy which ran simultaneous to the debate with Case, from December 18, 1895, to January 22, 1896,[101] may be described as the case of the oaths and the affidavits. We have already mentioned George A. Hubbell as the man who put up the $100 forfeit for Donald M. Ross in the Ross controversy.[102] A typical A.P.A. propagandist, Hubbell jumped into the fray by printing a priest's oath and a Jesuit oath in the *Call* on December 18.[103] Father Yorke secured affidavits from the Reverend John J. Prendergast, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, the Reverend Henry Imoda, S.J., superior of the California mission of the Society of Jesus, and the Reverend Henry H. Wyman, C.S.P., prominent Paulist convert. In these affidavits the three priests denied under oath the truth of Hubbell's oaths. This done, Yorke dared Hubbell to say openly that the three priests had lied, to which he added, "Then we shall know how to deal with you."[104] Needless to say, Hubbell did not call the priests liars, since that would expose him to a libel suit. This move should have silenced Hubbell, but with the amazing persistence characteristic of these A.P.A. agitators, he continued to print other

[96] *Ibid.*, December 24, 1895. Cf. J. P. Gury, *Compendium Theologiae Moralis* (Rome, 1887), p. 85.

[97] *Ibid.*

[98] *Ibid.*, December 25, 1895.

[99] *Ibid.*, December 27, 1895.

[100] *Ibid.*, December 28, 1895.

[101] *Ibid.*, December 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 1895; January 5, 9, 10, 22, 1896.

[102] *Ibid.*, December 4, 1895.

[103] *Ibid.*, December 18, 1895.

[104] *Ibid.*, December 20, 1895.

false oaths.[105] Meanwhile Yorke kept on asking him—in vain—to deal with the affidavits.

Of the other controversies two deserve mention. That with the Reverend F. D. Bovard, which lasted from December 28, 1895, to January 7, 1896,[106] was characterized by the editor of the *Monitor*'s clear and forceful condensation of the treatise *De Ecclesia*. The controversy with the Reverend Benjamin F. Hudelson, running from February 1-23, 1896,[107] was occasioned when that clergyman who was state president of the A.P.A., began to write to the *Call* in defense of the organization. In reply Father Yorke traced the history of the A.P.A. and exposed its essential viciousness.

The amount of work that these controversies entailed must have been enormous. In a brief space of three months and a half Yorke dealt with all kinds of questions from the number of Catholic convicts in San Quentin to the opinion of St. Robert Bellarmine on burning heretics. He was compelled to track down quotations, misinterpreted and sometimes mangled, from a variety of books and periodicals and the bibliography of the Wendte controversy alone contained forty-seven titles.[108] Moreover, Yorke had to be extremely careful of his syntax and spelling, since he pounced upon every slip of his opponents (of which there were several) to mock "the little-read patriots."

That the controversies aroused a great deal of interest and excitement in the city, one may gather from the attitude of the newspapers. The *Chronicle* had published the lecture of Ross that had started the debate, but it had refused to print Yorke's challenges. But they were published by the rival *Examiner*. The *Examiner* printed several letters of both disputants, then decided the affair was too hot to handle, and dropped it. Thereupon a third daily, the *Call*, took up the fight. Evidently readers were highly interested, for in January the *Examiner* changed its mind and printed an eight-page supplement bringing the entire controversy up to date.[109]

Since in the opinion of Yorke the *Chronicle* had treated the Catho-

[105] *Ibid.*, December 26, 1895; January 5, 1896.
[106] *Ibid.*, December 28, 1895; January 2, 3, 5, 7, 1896.
[107] *Ibid.*, February 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 1896.
[108] *The Yorke-Wendte Discussion*. The bibliography is given as an appendix.
[109] San Francisco *Examiner*, January 10, 1896. This supplement was up to date and was fairly accurate. The writer noticed only one divergence where a paragraph was omitted.

lics unfairly, he refused to give that paper any letters or news pertaining to the discussions.[110] Thus excluded from any share in the controversy, the *Chronicle* strove to stop it. In the issue of January 12 it pointed out in an editorial the danger of such controversy provoking riots and disturbances such as had characterized the Native American and Know-Nothing agitations.[111] It likewise printed statements from prominent citizens, Protestant and Catholic, deploring the quarrel.[112] In answer Yorke hit hard. In a letter to the people of San Francisco published in the *Call* for January 13 he placed the blame for the controversy squarely on the shoulders of the *Chronicle*. He pointed out that although the *Chronicle* had printed attacks on the Church, it had refused to publish a refutation of these attacks.[113] Yorke followed this up by blaming the cowardly attitude of the press in general and of the politicians for the spread of the A.P.A.[114]

The *Chronicle* followed up by saying that even Father Yorke would desire to end the controversy when he heard that the work of attacking churches had begun.[115] The attack in question was a shot fired into the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church on New Year's Eve and consisted in a bag of eggs deposited at the door of the same church. Yorke was quick to point out how maliciously stupid this report was. The pastor, the Reverend William S. Bovard, did not believe that the shot was malicious. The eggs were deposited by a small boy.[116] Yorke then destroyed the sanctimonious pretentions of the *Chronicle* by stating that John P. Young, the editor, had done his best to effect a reconciliation with him, and that when the controversy was raging at its fiercest, he had tried persistently to get news of a provocative nature. It was only after he realized that Father Yorke would not move from his determination to refuse him any share in it, that he

[110] *The Call* (San Francisco), January 15, 1896.

[111] San Francisco *Chronicle*, January 12, 1896.

[112] *Ibid.*

[113] *The Call* (San Francisco), January 13, 1896; cf. infra (115).

[114] *The Monitor*, November 10, 1894; *The Call* (San Francisco), January 15, 1896; *Ibid.*, August 18, 1896.

[115] *The Call* (San Francisco), January 15, 1896, quoted this. The *Chronicle* for January 13 is missing in the files of the San Francisco Public Library and in the University of California Library.

[116] *The Call* (San Francisco), January 15, 1896.

strove to put an end to the debate.[117] After the Ross controversy the A.P.A. issue once more subsided. There were, it is true, passages at arms between Father Yorke and John Q. A. Henry, Elbert R. Dille, and J. M. Alexander, but these did not attain the proportions of the 1895-1896 series of controversies.[118]

Meanwhile, within the ranks of the A.P.A. a drama of political corruption was unfolding itself, a drama which affords some light on the character of the association's leaders. Father Yorke, ever on guard against the attacks of the lodgers, had always maintained a close watch on the doings of the "Friends," and strangely enough he seemed to have no trouble obtaining information concerning the most secret activities of the lodges. For example, in 1894 the *Monitor* published the minutes of various A.P.A. lodge meetings week after week.[119] This close acquaintance was later to serve the editor in good stead as he discovered and revealed the inside story of an interesting conspiracy.

After dropping a series of ever stronger hints in the *Monitor*,[120] Yorke finally came out with the whole story in a series of articles beginning on June 13 of how the A.P.A. vote had been sold out to John D. Spreckles, owner of the *Call* and Republican political boss. Charles M. Shortridge, editor of the *Call*, finally took notice of the accusation in an open letter to Yorke.[121] The latter countered by asking him several pertinent questions,[122] and the *Call* editor replied in another open letter.[123] But the editor of the *Monitor* was by no means satisfied with the answers he received.[124]

According to Yorke,[125] Benjamin F. Hudelson, state president of

[117] *Ibid.*

[118] San Francisco *Examiner*, June 5, 9, 11, for Henry; June 30, July 3, 4, for Dille; July 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 28 for Alexander.

[119] *The Monitor*, October 6, 13, 27, 1894.

[120] *Ibid.*, May 9, June 6, 1896.

[121] *The Call* (San Francisco), August 11, 1896.

[122] *Ibid.*, August 13, 1896.

[123] *Ibid.*, August 14, 1896.

[124] San Francisco *Examiner*, October 13, 1896.

[125] *The Monitor*, June 13, 20, 27, 1896; *The Call* (San Francisco), August 13, 1896; San Francisco *Examiner*, October 6, 1896. The story of the sell-out was narrated by Yorke in the *Call* and *Examiner*. The *Monitor* gave more details and quoted from the record of his suit for the recovery of the affidavit and photograph.

the A.P.A., had conspired with several other leaders to deliver the A.P.A. vote to John D. Spreckles—for a consideration. Hudelson gave a letter introducing Henry F. Marshall, theological student at San Anselmo Presbyterian Seminary and part-time reporter on the *Call,* to Shortridge, editor of the same paper. The enterprising young theologian was also president of the A.P.A. Council No. 123 and had served as ghost writer for Hudelson in the Yorke-Hudelson controversy.[126] The letter from Hudelson was, needless to say, not to introduce Marshall, as he must have been well known to his editor, but to provide credentials enabling him to open negotiations for the sell-out. A.P.A. secretary, M. T. Brewer, suspecting that Marshall had such a document, went to Hudelson and upbraided him for his imprudence. Thereupon Hudelson asked Marshall to return the letter. Marshall did so, but not before he had a tintype made of it. He likewise made an affidavit that Hudelson and other leaders had planned to sell the A.P.A. vote to Spreckles for $60,000. Meanwhile Hudelson discarded Marshall, but the theological student was prepared. Against the plotters he counterplotted with the Reverend Donald M. Ross who had engaged Yorke in debate and D. B. Woodworth, a Canadian, who was seeking money to invest in a mine. The three proceeded to annoy Hudelson until the state president arranged an interview in the course of which Marshall was prevailed upon to hand over the documents. He expected to be paid handsomely but he soon realized he had been swindled. The canny Marshall had another shot left in his locker, as he had taken the precaution of having copies made of the incriminating documents. Nothing daunted, Marshall and his companions then threatened to break the Republican Party wide open by revealing the sell-out. Spreckles thereupon invited Marshall, the Reverend Mr. Ross, and Woodworth to a conference. Church affairs detained the minister, but Marshall and Woodworth went down to the business office of the *Call.* There Marshall was taken into an inner sanctum. After a good deal of bartering the enraged Spreckles struck Marshall violently on the mouth and followed up with a volley of blows that left him bloody, battered, and minus two teeth. Woodworth, alarmed at the sounds of conflict, discreetly withdrew. After the beating the Spreckles' party filled Marshall with whiskey and compelled him to sign a statement in which he acknowledged that he was a liar. This much done, the

[126] *The Monitor,* June 13, 1896, testimony of Henry F. Marshall.

poor fellow was sent home and to bed. After recovering he was taken down to the office of attorney Samuel M. Shortridge where he was forced to sign another document, retracting all that he had said in the ill-starred affidavit.

The alliance between Spreckels and the A.P.A. was consummated at the Republican state convention.[127] Spreckles and Hudelson between them controlled the convention and Hudelson then swung the A.P.A. vote behind Spreckles. The resulting ticket was not entirely A.P.A., but it had the support of the brethren and the principal offices were given to men who had taken the pledges of the A.P.A. Charles L. Taylor was their candidate for mayor and Curry their field captain and behind this ticket was the force of John D. Spreckles and of his paper, the *Call*.

To defeat this ticket in the election of 1896 was the object of the last major engagement in the struggle with the A.P.A. in San Francisco. The A.P.A. was slipping since the people were beginning to see it in its true colors.[128] Its last hope was in political patronage. This it would have if the Spreckles ticket should be victorious. Father Yorke was determined that this ticket should be defeated, but he realized that to end the A.P.A., the organization must be so crushed that no politician would again go near it.[129] In a series of lectures at Metropolitan Hall before large and enthusiastic audiences Yorke hammered at the A.P.A. with telling effect.[130] He pointed out its menace to the Constitution,[131] he uncovered the evils it brought in its train, he held up its bigotry to scorn, and he flayed its leaders mercilessly. He retold the story of the sell-out, showing the famous affidavit to his audience.[132] Moreover, he put the issue squarely up to Taylor, the Spreckles candidate for mayor, by asking him to declare for religious liberty and to repudiate the A.P.A.[133] In fine, Yorke left no doubt in men's minds as to the connection between the A.P.A. and the Spreckles ticket.

[127] *The Monitor*, October 17, 1896, where the speech of Grey is reprinted from minutes of A.P.A. Council No. 1.

[128] San Francisco *Examiner*, August 25, September 29, 1896.

[129] *Ibid.*, September 29, 1896.

[130] *Ibid.*, September 1, 4, 15, 29; October 6, 27, 30, 1896.

[131] *Ibid.*, September 29, 1896, "The Growth of the Upas Tree."

[132] *Ibid.*, October 6, 1896.

[133] *Ibid.*

In these lectures the editor of the *Monitor* insisted that he was not in politics and he sternly rebuked those who attempted to link his name with any particular candidate.[134] His only interest, he maintained, was to defeat the A.P.A. ticket and he let it be known that of five candidates for mayor four were unobjectionable. In his lecture on October 29 Father Yorke denounced political Catholics, even going so far as to say that they were worse than the A.P.A.'s.[135] With five candidates for mayor, Yorke clearly saw the danger of a split vote and for that reason he urged the voters to concentrate their power behind the strongest of the unobjectionable candidates. As to the identity of the strongest candidate, the priest remained discreetly silent, although it must have been fairly obvious to the people. Besides the defeat of the ticket backed by the A.P.A., there was one other objective in Father Yorke's campaign—the defeat of the proposed new city charter. This charter he opposed because one of its clauses transcended politics, namely, the clause stipulating that only public school graduates should be hired in public schools.[136] This naturally would penalize the graduates of Catholic schools.

The lectures were well attended[137] and Metropolitan Hall, the very place where the A.P.A. orators had so often vilified the Catholic Church, rang with the applause of thousands as Father Yorke raised his voice in defense of religious liberty and toleration. Introducing the Catholic editor at these lectures were men like Julius Kahn, for many years a worthy representative of California in Congress;[138] James D. Phelan, candidate for mayor and afterwards United States senator;[139] prominent rabbis and outstanding attorneys. The Yorke lectures were reprinted in the San Francisco *Examiner* and thus reached a wide circle of readers. They had their effect. The election resulted in a signal victory for Father Yorke and the cause of tolerance. The Spreckles ticket was defeated, James D. Phelan, a Catholic,

[134] *Ibid.*, October 27, 1896.
[135] *Ibid.*, October 30, 1896.
[136] *Ibid.*
[137] The extent of their popularity could be gleaned by the descriptive phrases accompanying the write-ups, e.g., San Francisco *Examiner*, September 1, 1896, "Standing Room only at Metropolitan Hall"; *Ibid.*, September 4, "One of the largest and most demonstrative audiences that ever assembled at Metropolitan Hall"; *Ibid.*, September 29, 1896.
[138] *Ibid.*, October 6, 1896.
[139] *Ibid.*, October 4, 1896.

was elected mayor of the city, and the proposed charter was rejected.[140] It was the end of the A.P.A. in San Francisco.

The struggle against the A.P.A. in San Francisco had been fought and won. It had been a hard fight, for many Catholics were at first apathetic, others frightened; many, too, were unaware of the danger which threatened should the A.P.A. succeed. The press had been cowardly where it was not hostile. Politicians had quailed before the prospect of losing the A.P.A. votes. But Peter Yorke changed all this. It had been, in good measure, a single-handed fight.[141] Staunchly backed by Archbishop Riordan, the young priest had defended the Church against the attacks of the bigots. Not content with mere refutation, he had given wide publicity to true Catholic doctrine. He had assumed the offensive and had striven mightily to break the power of the A.P.A. by exposing its disloyal constitution, its evil aims, and the unsavory character of its leaders. And today over a half century removed from these events while the A.P.A. is but a moldy *fin de siècle* memory, every Palm Sunday[142] sees amid floral tributes from widely scattered sources, a touching service at the grave of the crusader for religious liberty and toleration, Father Peter C. Yorke.

Loyola University
Los Angeles

[140] *The Monitor*, November 7, 1896.

[141] Cf. Rabbi Mayer Levy's and Attorney John D. Barrett's tributes, San Francisco *Examiner*, August 25, September 29, 1896.

[142] Yorke died on April 5, 1925.

BENEDICT XV, WILSON, MICHAELIS, AND GERMAN SOCIALISM

By

JOHN L. SNELL*

The peace efforts of Pope Benedict XV which inspired much hope in 1917 have been generally underemphasized in historical accounts of the period. At least one of the standard texts on twentieth century European history makes no mention whatever of the Pontiff's note of August 1, 1917,[1] and other similar texts give it scant attention. The great attention customarily given to the "bourgeois" proposals of President Woodrow Wilson for "peace without victory" in January, 1917, and to the "proletarian" appeals of the Bolsheviks after the November revolution has greatly overshadowed the papal effort. Yet, after President Wilson strapped on his armor in April, 1917, this was the most significant neutral effort to end World War I.

The factors that caused Benedict XV to make his 1917 peace appeal, and those which insured its failure, are complex. Most important of the circumstances which prompted the papal note was the generally anti-war attitude that prevailed in Europe in mid-1917. War weariness was then no longer a national characteristic; it had become the most common denominator of people from Ulster to the Siberian wastelands, and a matter of concern for their statesmen. The new recruit in the Allied camp was justly fearful that the popular demand for peace might force the desertion of veteran comrades from the field of battle. "Unless we can break down Germany from within, I am afraid of what may happen in France and Russia before the year ends," Colonel Edward M. House advised President Wilson on July 19, 1917.[2] There were revolts in the French army in May, indicating that the slogan "no annexations, no indemnities," which echoed into western Europe out of the Russian revolution of March, recognized no national boundaries.[3] Even in Great Britain there were demands for a statement of moderate war aims. The speech that Prime Minister David Lloyd George delivered on June 29 was interpreted by many

* Mr. Snell is assistant professor of history in the University of Wichita.

[1] F. Lee Benns, *Europe since 1918 in Its World Setting*, 6th ed. (New York, 1945).

[2] Library of Congress, Woodrow Wilson Papers. House to Wilson, July 19, 1917.

as an expression of willingness to accept a "peace of understanding," and that he was primarily interested in guaranteeing the future independence of Belgium.[4]

In the Central Powers also there was growing agitation for peace. Count Ottokar Czernin, Austrian minister of foreign affairs, warned on April 12 that another winter campaign was "out of the question."[5] The Slavic minorities in the Dual Monarchy were becoming belligerently restive, having "almost literally made the expressions of Wilson their own," according to one observer.[6] From the industrial centers of Austria there were other reports of rising unrest. "The prudent Social Democratic leaders are scarcely able to hold the masses back," the Austrian journalist, Viktor Naumann, reported on June 16 to Crown Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria.[7]

In Germany the desire for peace was even more explicitly manifested. There the "prudent" Social Democrats were threatened with a secession movement by those Marxists who considered opposition to the war even more important than party solidarity. The result was the creation of the Independent Social Democratic Party (U.S.P.D.) in April, 1917.[8] The vigor of the new party caused the leaders of the

[3] Friedrich Ritter von Lama, *Die Friedensvermittlung Papst Benedikt XV. und ihre Vereitlung durch den deutschen Reichskanzler Michaelis (August-September, 1917); eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung* (München, 1932), p. 3. This work, although a Catholic polemic against Michaelis, is the fullest study of the subject and is based upon exhaustive primary research. Cf. pp. 1-19 for a discussion of the war weariness in Europe at large during the summer of 1917. For the situation in Germany cf. John L. Snell, "The German Socialists and Wilson's Peace Policy, 1914-1918," pp. 117-151. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1949.

[4] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 15, quoting from a report of Viktor Naumann to Crown Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria, June 16, 1917. Cf. also Robert A. Kann, *The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Hapsburg Monarchy, 1848-1918*, 2 vols. (New York, 1950), II, 260-270.

[7] Lama, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[8] For stenographic reports of the proceedings of the Gotha conference cf. the Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, April 14-25, 1917. For a discussion of the underlying causes of the secession cf. Ossip K. Flechtheim, *Die kommunistische Partei Deutschlands in der Weimarer Republik* (Offenbach A. M., 1948), pp. 1-23. Cf. also William H. Maehl, "The German Socialists and the Foreign Policy of the Reich, 1917-1922," pp. 17 ff. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1947.

parent organization (the Social Democratic Party, or S.P.D.) to reconsider their previous policies. The official organ of the S.P.D., the Berlin *Vorwärts*, on April 28 stated: "To work for an early peace is now the most important task." A Socialist member of the Saxon Landtag, who earlier had advocated German victory, now declared that the German people recognized "no other wish than that for peace."[9] In the Imperial Reichstag Philipp Scheidemann, veteran leader of the S.P.D. during three years of support for the German government, caused a furore by warning that there would be "revolution in the land" if the Entente powers were to renounce annexations and the German government continue the war for "aims of conquest."[10] Prince Max of Baden, the future chancellor-for-a-month, warned on July 7 against a "growing war weariness among all classes." Enemy propaganda to the effect that peace was contingent upon German democratization was adding to the unrest. "This infamous suggestion is believed and is being made use of, at least by the Social Democrats," asserted Prince Max.[11]

Politically, the German peace movement centered in the Reichstag. By July 1 Scheidemann was convinced that a clear statement of Germany's willingness for peace must be made if the government was to retain the support of the S.P.D.[12] At about the same time the Center Party leader, Mathias Erzberger, reached a similar decision. On July 4 and again on July 6 he proposed to the Main Committee of the Reichstag that a resolution be drawn up declaring that Germany fought only to defend the Fatherland, and that the Reichstag majority favored the negotiation of a peace of understanding. It was "cheaper to build asylums" for 25,000 annexationists than to continue the war another year, Erzberger asserted.[13]

[9] Reported in the Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, May 9, 1917.

[10] *Verhandlungen des Reichstags*, CCCIX (May 15, 1917), 3394-3395.

[11] Max von Baden, *Erinnerungen und Dokumente* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1927), p. 106.

[12] Cf. Scheidemann's article, "Reich, schaffe Recht," Berlin *Vorwärts*, July 1, 1917.

[13] Lama, *op. cit.*, p. 40; Hans W. Gatzke, *Germany's Drive to the West (Drang nach Westen): A Study of Germany's Western War Aims during the First World War* (Baltimore, 1950), p. 189. Both Scheidemann and Erzberger viewed a declaration of imperial policy as an imperative necessity in order to restore internal unity. Both let it be known that they did not favor renunciation of all annexations and indemnities. Cf. Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 204, and Erich Ludendorff, *The General Staff and Its Problems*, 2 vols., trans. by F. A. Holt (New York), II, 474.

Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg was caught between the demands of those who followed public opinion and those of the army high command.[14] The Reichstag opposition moved him to offer his resignation on July 10, and an ultimatum from Hindenburg and Ludendorff caused the Kaiser to accept it three days later.[15] To head the cabinet a person was needed who had antagonized neither the generals nor the parliamentarians. Georg Michaelis, the relatively unknown, pietistically Protestant food commissioner of Prussia, was selected for the position. Michaelis hesitated before accepting such a grave assignment, but his verse for the day was reassuring on July 13: "Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed," he read. Fortified by the words of Joshua, Michaelis accepted the call of his king and emperor.[16]

The first big issue Michaelis had to face was the Reichstag peace resolution. *Vorwärts* warned on July 14 that no politician whose convictions were not in accord with the proposed resolution should accept the chancellorship. The parties behind the resolution, the Center, the Progressive, and the Social Democratic, now waited to see what the official reaction of the new chancellor would be. On July 19, with the Kerensky offensive in the East still unchecked, Michaelis went before the Reichstag and climbed upon the rail he was to straddle precariously but persistently during his "Hundred Days" in office. The resolution presented for his approval[17] declared Germany's readiness to conclude a "peace of understanding and permanent reconciliation of peoples." It stated that "forced acquisitions of territory and political, economic, or financial oppressions" were inconsistent with such a peace. Michaelis nullified the resolution, and left everyone to his own imagination as to what his convictions were, by admitting that his own ends were "attainable within the limits of your resolution, as I construe it."[18] Privately, Michaelis hoped that military suc-

[14] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-45; Gatzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-192.

[15] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 192; Ludendorff, *op. cit.*, II, 462.

[16] Cf. Georg Michaelis, *Für Staat und Volk: eine Lebensgeschichte* (Berlin, 1922), p. 321.

[17] *Verhandlungen des Reichstags*, CCCX (July 19, 1917), 3573-3576. The text of the Reichstag Resolution was on its way to Washington, by way of the Swiss Legation, on July 20, 1917. United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917*, Supp. 2, 2 vols. (Washington, 1932), I, 139-140. Hereinafter cited as *Foreign Relations*.

[18] *Verhandlungen des Reichstag*, CCCX (July 19, 1917), 3570-3573. Although rendered innocuous, the resolution has been called by German rightists

cesses would make possible an interpretation favorable to Germany.[19] But his comments were ambiguous enough to permit the Reichstag majority parties to boast that their government fought only for defense.

For several weeks leaders of the Catholic Center Party supported the new government because they considered the resolution their own. The S.P.D., for similar reasons, temporarily endorsed Michaelis. On July 20 representatives of the S.P.D. were among those who attended a reception in the garden of the ministry of the interior, where, in the vituperative words of Schiedemann's post-war memoirs, "The Kaiser stood talking to his victims for a whole hour."[20] This was not the S.P.D. reaction of 1917, however. A Social Democrat, Dr. August Müller, was appointed an assistant undersecretary of state in the War Food Control Department during the governmental reorganization, and *Vorwärts* interpreted this as proof that Marxist political views no longer constituted a bar to public office. The S.P.D. press vigorously attacked the Independent Socialists for their refusal to support the July Resolution, and defended continued support for the imperial government on the grounds of Michaelis' questionable acceptance of the Reichstag Resolution.[21] The extreme left reaction

---

"the turning point in the history of the German nation on its way from collapse to catastrophe!" Wolfgang Breithaupt, *Volksvergiftung, 1914-1918. Dokumente der Vorbereitung des 9. November 1918* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1925), p. 77.

[19] Michaelis, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-329; 365; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-56. At times, however, Michaelis tried to show that he favored a peace of conciliation. Cf. Lama, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

[20] Philipp Scheidemann, *The Making of New Germany: The Memoirs of Philipp Scheidemann*, 2 vols., trans. by J. E. Michell (New York, 1929), II, 47.

[21] Cf., e.g., Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, August 3, 7, 30, and September 8, 1917; *Correspondenzblatt der General Kommission der Gewerkschaften Deutschlands*, XXVII (July 21, 1917), 273-275; *ibid.* (July 28, 1917), 281-283; *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, XXIII (August 1, 1917), 763-768; Leipzig *Freie Presse*, July 30, August 8, 1917. The *Freie Presse* was established in the summer of 1917 by the S.P.D., reportedly with the blessings of the imperial government. Cf. *Arbeiterführer als Verräter. Dokumente aus der Kriegszeit, aus den Akten der Kriegsamtstelle Leipzig* (Leipzig, n.d.), p. 12. (Copy in New York Public Library.) The U.S.P.D. refused to support the Reichstag Resolution because it was regarded as ineffective and misleading. Cf. A. Joseph Berlau, *The German Social Democratic Party, 1914-1921* (New York, 1949), p. 150.

to the July resolution was the scornful Spartacist assertion: "There is no way to peace except revolution!"[22]

As if in contradiction to the radicals, a new way to peace was opened in August. Even before Michaelis approved with reservations the German Reichstag's resolution, Pope Benedict XV had been preparing to act in the interest of peace.[23] As a first step the Roman Curia tried to determine the war aims of the belligerent powers. On June 26 the papal nuncio in Munich, Archbishop Eugenio Pacelli (later to become Pope Pius XII), sounded Bethmann-Hollweg for Germany's view on specific issues, but received ambiguous assurances on the key problems of Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine.[24] Two days later Pacelli was received by Kaiser Wilhelm II at Kreuznach, military headquarters in the West. The emperor welcomed the papal peace overture, stating that it was in the interest of the Church to launch an effort which would break the monopoly the Socialists had hitherto exercised over the peace movement.[25] After Michaelis took office Pacelli conferred with him in Berlin on July 24-26, presenting for his reaction a peace program which was much the same as that eventually offered by the formal papal note of August 1. Michaelis was generally favorable, but noncommital, stating that he must first consult the Austrian government.[26]

Michaelis and Count Czernin on August 1 discussed the issues raised by the nuncio, at which time it was made clear that Germany wanted to expand her overseas territories and to retain a free hand in Belgium. These views were aired again in a conference between Michaelis and the high command on August 9. Czernin's suggestion

[22] Cf. Ernst Drahn and Susanne Leonhard, *Unterirdische Literatur im revolutionären Deutschland während des Weltkrieges* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 84-88.

[23] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-33; H. J. T. Johnson, *Vatican Diplomacy in the World War* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 24-29; Michaelis, *op. cit.*, pp. 335-341; M. Erzberger, *Erlebnisse im Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1920), pp. 269-287; Erich Ludendorff, *My War Memories, 1914-1918*, 2 vols. (London, 1919), II, 513-516; Ludendorff, *The General Staff and Its Problems*, II, 478-516; Philipp Scheidemann, *Papst, Kaiser und Sozialdemokratie in ihren Friedensbemühungen im Sommer 1917* (Berlin, 1921), *passim*; Scheidemann, *The Making of New Germany*, II, 50-72; Scheidemann, *Der Zusammenbruch* (Berlin, 1921), pp. 106-114.

[24] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-31.

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

that Germany give up Alsace-Lorraine was rebuffed.[27] Hindenburg and Ludendorff had at last found in Michaelis just the pliable instrument they so badly needed to represent their interests in the government.

Unaware of this situation, the Papacy went ahead with its plans to issue formal proposals to the belligerent powers. The papal note, dated August 1, 1917, was handed to the German government on August 15. The Pope emphasized his impartiality as a mediator, insisting that he was now, as in his previous efforts, actuated by a sense of supreme duty "as the common father of the faithful." The time had now come for "more concrete and practical proposals" and he called for acceptance of his note as the basis for a "just and lasting peace." The Pontiff proposed "the simultaneous and reciprocal decrease of armaments"; machinery for arbitration of international disputes; freedom of the seas; renunciation of reparations; restitution of occupied territories, and specific guarantees of the "political, military, and economic independence" of Belgium; determination of the future of border areas and minorities in accordance with the "aspirations of the population" and the "general good of the great human society."[28]

There was considerable reason to hope that the papal entreaty would bear fruit. It contained many of the basic principles of President Wilson, whose neutral peace moves had been favored by the Vatican.[29] The complete restoration of Belgium would have gone far toward satisfying the war-weary British leaders.[30] The Holy See could count upon the support of Catholic leaders in the belligerent nations and, because it incorporated many of their own demands in its note, it might even win the backing of European Socialists. On the other hand, there were the mutual suspicions between nations and peoples which were in some cases traceable back to the Protestant Revolt, and in all instances exacerbated by three years of officially sponsored hate. Annexationists in all the warring nations denounced

[27] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-221.

[28] The text of the Pope's note is easily referred to in Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law (James Brown Scott, ed.), *Official Statements of War Aims and Peace Proposals, December 1916 to November 1918* (New York, 1925), pp. 129-131; *Foreign Relations, 1917,* Supp. 2, I, 162-164; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-75.

[29] Erzberger, *op. cit.*, p. 273; Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-24.

[30] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62.

the note. Those in Britain, France, and Italy asserted that it was inspired by Germany.[31] In Germany there were religious overtones to chauvinistic criticisms. "Why, in the year of the jubilee of the Reformation, should we accept a peace negotiated by the Pope," indignantly inquired one evangelical member of the Reichstag.[32]

The response of the German Socialists to the papal note is an interesting chapter in the history of European Marxism, but one that has hitherto received scant attention.[33] German Social Democracy, theoretically Godless and consequently not influenced by sectarian prejudices, was generally favorable in its reaction, excellent proof of the sincerity of Socialist peace propaganda at the time. German nationalism, Marxist agnosticism, and party jealousy—not any of these outweighed the desire for peace among the Socialists in mid-1917.[34] Temporarily the aim of the Church and the aim of the Socialists coincided; few of the latter were so doctrinaire as to renounce co-operation which might lead to the realization of a common ideal. The Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung* (S.P.D.) commented: "We Social Democrats . . . wish with sincere hearts success for the papal effort. For the great cause of peace is high above all party conflict; with thankful hearts we rejoice that Pope Benedict once again raises his influential voice and gives new hope to humanity, bleeding from a thousand wounds."[35] The Pontiff's note would give a "new, powerful impulse to the movement for peace," another S.P.D. journal affirmed.[36]

It was abundantly pointed out that the most essential step for the German government was an immediate and unambiguous renunciation of any ambition to limit the independence of Belgium after the war.[37] Scheidemann wrote in the Berlin *Vorwärts* on September 6, 1917, of his hope that the German reply would clearly signify the

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 85-89.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 117 ff.; cf. also Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

[33] There is no mention of the papal note in the most scholarly published work in English dealing with German Socialism during this period, i.e., Berlau's *The German Social Democratic Party, 1914-1921.*

[34] Cf. Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, August 18, 1917.

[35] *Ibid.*, August 29, 1917.

[36] Leipzig *Freie Presse*, September 1, 1917.

[37] Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, August 18, 1917. For an extreme right Socialist view cf. also Paul Lensch, "Die schwarze und die rote Internationale," *Die Glocke*, III (August 25, 1917), 827-831; Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, August 16, 1917.

intention to restore Belgium. After the war he wrote: "there could be no doubt that an explicit promise to surrender Belgium was required from Germany in order to ensure the success of the pope's venture."[38]

The Pontiff's note posed a real problem for the new chancellor of Germany. If, in his reply, Georg Michaelis betrayed the faith of the already suspicious Pan-Germans and of the supreme command by renouncing Belgium, these forces would tumble him from the heights to which he had so suddenly been raised. On the other hand, without gaining the support of the Reichstag majority, clamoring for a peace without annexations, Michaelis could not hope to get the Reichstag to approve the war credits which were essential for the fulfillment of his policies. Germany was stalled in a twilight zone between military autocracy and responsible parliamentary government, and "Little Charlie Two-Face in the chair of Bismarck," as Scheidemann called Michaelis, tried to keep her there with himself at her helm by following a twilight policy.[39] On August 21 he announced to the Main Committee of the Reichstag his sympathy with the proposals of Benedict XV, and his plans to have Reichstag members participate in the drafting of a German reply.[40] Then on the following morning the chancellor denied before this group that he was bound by the July Reichstag Resolution. In the afternoon, however, he intimated that his ends were attainable in accordance with that resolution.[41] His credit with left and right impaired by his own ambiguity,[42] Michaelis offered a weak concession to parliamentarism. A committee of seven trusted Reichstag deputies and an equal number of representatives from the Bundesrat was formed to discuss confidentially with the chancellor a reply to the Pope. This Committee of Seven,

[38] Scheidemann, *The Making of New Germany*, II, 52.

[39] *Ibid.*, II, 55.

[40] Cf. report of the session of the Main Committee on August 21 in Berlin *Vorwärts*, August 22, 1917; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-102. The Main Committee of the Reichstag had been given the right to discuss important matters of state, especially foreign policy, in 1916. It was composed of leaders of the Reichstag parties and met even when the Reichstag was not in plenary session.

[41] Cf. report of Main Committee proceedings, Berlin *Vorwärts*, August 23, 1917; Lama, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[42] For S.P.D. views cf. Berlin *Vorwärts*, August 23, 1917; Leipzig *Freie Presse*, August 23, 1917; Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, August 25, 27, 1917.

so-called, began its work on August 28 and proceeded slowly, the public being informed that Germany's answer would be delayed until after full discussions with Vienna could be completed.[43]

After surveying the primary and secondary literature on the chancellor's policy one can scarcely escape the conclusion reached by Friedrich von Lama, namely, that Michaelis hoped to create the impression that he approved the papal action, but stalled for time, looking for a chance to throw the responsibility for the continuation of the war upon the enemy.[44] It is of generally unacknowledged significance that Wilson, who did not wait to consult the Allied heads of state, replied to Benedict XV on August 27, providing a very timely diversion for Georg Michaelis.

Previous efforts to explain the frustration of the papal effort have neglected the refusal of the President of the United States to agree to peace negotiations. Friedrich von Lama gave Wilson's note five pages (two and a half being the text of the note), concluding that Wilson's answer was "only an affront against the Pope," and that it "in no way abated the general desire for peace. . . ."[45] This deemphasizing of Wilson's reply is not justified by an impartial examination of the historical record. In the following pages it should be made clear that the American reply diverted attention from the papal note, and certainly abated the *demands* for peace in Germany, if not the actual *desires* for it.

In brief, Wilson like Michaelis sought to shift the responsibility for the continuation of the war upon the enemy, although his tactic was to gain the initiative rather than to stall for time. There were many reasons why the note from the Vatican seemed inopportune to Wilson. Should peace negotiations be opened in August, 1917, the Cen-

[43] Cf. report of Michaelis' statement before the Main Committee, August 21, 1917, in Berlin *Vorwärts*, August 22, 1917. The Reichstag members of the special committee were Mathias Erzberger and Konstantin Fehrenbach (Center); Count Kuno von Westarp (Conservative); Gustav Stresemann (National Liberal); Friedrich Ebert and Philipp Scheidemann (S.P.D.); and Dr. O. Wiemer (Progressive). The name, Committee of Seven, which was given the new agency is misleading because of the participation of Bundesrat members, the chancellor himself, and his consultants in the deliberations of the committee. Cf. Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 108 ff.; Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

[44] Lama, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

tral Powers would enjoy a considerable advantage because of their military superiority. In the West German armies stood deep in France and controlled all Belgium; in eastern Europe the Russian Kerensky offensive had been checked and Russian forces routed, following the German counterattack which began on July 19. Wilson, whom some persist in mistaking for an ivory tower idealist, was quite conscious of these circumstances.[46] Furthermore, there was as yet no general agreement among the Allies as to war aims; any discussion now would produce undesirable dissensions.[47] Even Wilson's negative reply to the Pope was not discussed with the Entente governments. "I felt morally certain that they would wish changes which I could not make," the President wrote to House on September 2, 1917.[48] Of fundamental importance also in causing Wilson to refuse peace negotiations was his conviction that "no lasting peace could be made with the existing Government of Germany."[49] He believed that a government which was domestically irresponsible would act accordingly in its international relations.

[46] Not only was Wilson unwilling to discuss peace himself, but he urged the American press to follow his example. On October 5, 1917, he wrote to David Lawrence: "The Germans have in effect recognized their programme of Hamburg to Bagdad . . . and if they could bring about a discussion of peace now, would insist upon discussing it upon terms which would leave them in possession of all that they ever expected to get." Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters*, 8 vols. (New York, 1927-1939), VII, 294.

[47] In the summer of 1917 Wilson discouraged a suggestion by Frank Cobb and Colonel House that a newspaper debate be held between Allied and German statesmen in order to clarify war aims, because he feared the Allies could not agree among themselves. Charles Seymour (ed.), *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, 4 vols. (Boston, 1926-1928), III, 140-144. Wilson had in a similar fashion dissuaded Allan F. Benson, Socialist candidate for the presidency in 1916, from sending a cable to Scheidemann regarding the instigation of peace negotiations. Cf. Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*, VII, 132-133.

[48] Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*, VII, 253-254.

[49] Charles Seymour, *American Diplomacy during the World War* (Baltimore, 1934), p. 275. Seymour was intimately acquainted with Wilson's policy through his wartime position as chief of the Austro-Hungarian division in the House "Inquiry," and afterward on the American Commission to Negotiate the Peace. Perhaps Wilson's desire to be the chief architect of the peace influenced his reaction to the papal note. According to the war-time French ambassador to Washington, Jules Jusserand, Wilson "plainly showed" his "ill-humor at Benedict XV's wanting to 'butt in' (his own words)." Cf. Jusserand's letter to the editor of the *American Historical Review*, XXXVII (July, 1932), 818.

Despite all these considerations it was difficult to renounce flatly the Pope's appeal. Wide circles within the United States might be alienated thereby and, at least as important as this, the moral leadership of world opinion, sought for by Germany in the Reichstag Resolution, might be assumed by that country through clever utilization of an inconsiderate American rejection of peace possibilities. So skillful was Wilson's solution of this problem that Erzberger, patriotic German and leader of the Catholic Center Party, placed complete blame for the failure of the Pope's appeal upon his own government.[50] More significant evidence of the President's success is the fact that most historians have previously agreed with Erzberger.

A combination of suavity and crudeness, Wilson's reply to His Holiness contained a refusal to discuss peace, which was overshadowed by a denunciation of the German imperial government. On September 4, 1917, the President stated that he wrote his reply "almost as a matter of course, because the whole body of issues . . . has assumed in my mind a great simplicity, and there seemed to be no other way of stating it."[51] Without questioning Wilson's sincerity, it must be pointed out that he took pains to be sure there was "no other way of stating it." Soon after the United States had entered the war, at Wilson's request Colonel House had begun to "develop propaganda destined . . . to encourage the liberal elements in all countries."[52] House now advised the President to answer the papal note "in some such way as to leave the door open and to throw the onus on Prussia."[53] On August 17 he suggested: "A statement from you setting forth the real issues would have an enormous effect and would probably bring about such an upheaval in Germany *as we*

[50] Erzberger, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

[51] Wilson to Arthur Brisbane, September 4, 1917, Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*, VII, 258.

[52] Seymour (ed.), *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III, 126.

[53] House to Wilson, August 15, 1917, *ibid.*, p. 153. House himself got advice from various quarters. Wilson's personal secretary, Joseph P. Tumulty, wrote to him on August 16: "When the President said in his address of April second, last, that we were not making war on the German people, I believe he set the stage for the abdication of the Kaiser. And I think our whole note in reply to the Pope should be so framed that this idea would always be kept in the forefront of our discussion so as to bring home to the people of Germany the distrust and utter contempt in which the ruling powers of Germany are held by the peoples of the world." Joseph P. Tumulty, *Woodrow Wilson As I Know Him* (Garden City, 1921), pp. 280-281.

desire."[54] Wilson was fully advised through the Department of State of the reaction of the German political parties to the Pope's appeal.[55] Finally, when he had completed his draft reply, Wilson dispatched it to House, telling him that his "many useful suggestions" had been in his mind all the while he wrote. "Please tell me exactly what you think of it," he requested.[56] He stated that he had tried to indicate "the attitude of this country on the points most discussed in the socialistic and other camps."[57] House expressed his satisfaction and suggested very little change in his answer to the President. What he wrote of the note to Arthur James Balfour, British foreign minister, was more significant for this study. Balfour was told that the President's note would serve "to unite Russia and add to the confusion in Germany."[58]

Wilson's answer to Pope Benedict XV was dispatched on August 27 and was made public two days later.[59] Besides the reports carried by the German press, those Germans who were interested in the President's criticisms of their government could obtain his message in leaflets, introduced into Germany through Allied channels as potent propaganda.[60] The message praised the Pontiff's intentions, but pointed out that the American reply "must be based upon the stern facts and upon nothing else." Benedict XV's proposals amounted to a return to the *status quo ante bellum*, said Wilson. But this would only make possible the recuperation of strength which German militarists desired. In a call for German revolution as obvious as the brasses in a contemporary ragtime band, the President stated that the American people desired "no reprisal against the German people"; instead, they fought to "deliver the free peoples of the world from the

[54] House to Wilson, August 17, 1917, Seymour (ed.), *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III, 157. My italics.

[55] Marshall Langhorne, chargé in the Netherlands, to the Secretary of State, August 22, 1917. *Foreign Relations, 1917*, Supp. 2, I, 169.

[56] Wilson to House, August 22, 1917, Seymour (ed.), *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III, 163.

[57] Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*, VII, 231.

[58] House to Balfour, August 24, 1917, Seymour (ed.), *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, III, 166-167.

[59] *Foreign Relations, 1917*, Supp. 2, I, 177-179.

[60] Cf. George D. Bruntz, *Allied Propaganda and the Collapse of the German Empire in 1918* (Stanford, 1938), p. 131. During the fall of 1917 German and Swiss frontier guards alone intercepted 100,000 copies of Wilson's messages. Others made their way into Germany through other channels. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible government." It was upon this basis that Wilson justified his rejection of peace discussions. He stated:

> We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guarantee of anything that is to endure, unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidences of the will and purpose of the German people themselves as the other people of the world would be justified in accepting. . . . *We must await some new evidence of the purposes of the great peoples of the Central Empires.*[61]

In Germany, where it was published on September 1, Wilson's reply created the confusion that had been expected by Colonel House. It was to be assumed that the Conservatives and other annexationists would violently denounce the President's interference in Germany's domestic affairs, and this result was not surprising. The Sedan Day manifesto of the new Fatherland "Party" protested that "German freedom" stood "heaven high" above the "unreal democracies and all their vaunted blessings, which English hypocrisy and Wilson prate of in order thereby to destroy Germany."[62] Meetings were held in Hamburg, Munich, Stuttgart, and other cities of Germany to protest against Wilson's presumption, and these manifested reactions were duly transmitted to Washington.[63] When the German Reichstag next met in plenary session Progressive, Center, National Liberal, and Conservative speakers followed the lead of the presiding officer in fully venting their wrath against Wilson's efforts to divide Germany.[64] Konstantin Fehrenbach of the Center Party, amidst cheers from his colleagues, called Wilson's note "a poison-swollen, lying attack against the German people by one of their worst enemies."[65]

[61] Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd (eds.), *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson,* 6 vols. (New York and London, 1925-1927), V, 93-96. My italics.

[62] Ralph Haswell Lutz (ed.), *Fall of the German Empire, 1914-1918,* 2 vols. (Stanford, 1932), I, 368-370.

[63] Pleasant A. Stovall, minister to Switzerland, to the Secretary of State, September 11, 1917, *Foreign Relations,* Supp. 2, I, 200; Hugh Wilson, chargé in Switzerland, to the Secretary of State, September 21, 1917, *ibid.,* p. 210.

[64] *Verhandlungen des Reichstags,* CCCX (September 26, 1917), 2618-2619; *ibid.* (October 9, 1917), p. 3809; *ibid.* (October 10, 1917), pp. 3822, 3830, 3837, 3844.

[65] *Ibid.* (October 9, 1917), p. 3809.

In such an environment the success or failure of Wilson's effort to reject peace negotiations without antagonizing pacifist and reform groups, even in the enemy countries, is tested most rigorously by a review of German Socialist reaction. In general the Socialists stood for both peace and domestic reform. If their dream of domestic democratization should make them responsive to Wilson's call for reform, and obscure his refusal to discuss peace terms, the strategy of the President would be proved successful. The response of German Marxists was conditioned by partisan differences and by previous Wilson statements.[66] During the summer, while German Socialists had been eager for a negotiated peace, the American crusader was busily girding on the sword; German Socialists were cynical of the scabbard of idealism that covered it. They were especially incensed by the refusal of the United States government to grant American Socialists passports to attend an international Socialist conference, scheduled to be held in Stockholm.[67] On August 21 the Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung* advised its readers that they would soon see how Wilson, "once a great 'friend of peace' and now a still greater war monger," would react to the papal note. The August atmosphere augured an ill reception of Wilson's answer, regardless of its nature.

The right wing of the S.P.D. denounced the President's note much as it had criticized his earlier expressions. The editors of the journal *Die Glocke,* mouthpiece of the Socialist annexationists, had already rejected many of the reforms which Wilson demanded in Germany. Many of the contributors to this magazine, such as Ernst Heilmann, thought more of administration by a bureaucracy of experts than by representatives of the people in the parliamentary system.[68] A. Runde asserted on September 1 that the President of the United States had far more power than the French president, and in foreign

[66] Cf. my article, "German Socialist Reaction to Wilsonian Diplomacy: From Neutrality to Belligerency," *Journal of Central European Affairs,* IX (April, 1949), 61-79.

[67] Berlin *Vorwärts,* August 18, 1917; Leipzig *Freie Presse,* August 15, 1917; Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung,* August 9, 15, 1917. For an account of the efforts of European Socialists to arrange an international wartime conference in Stockholf cf. Merle Fainsod, *International Socialism and the World War* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 124 ff.

[68] Cf. Edwyn Bevan, *German Social Democracy during the War* (London, 1918), pp. 209-210, for a review in English of Heilmann's views, especially as originally presented in *Die Glocke,* III, August 26, 1917.

affairs possessed an "almost absolute authority."[69] *Die Glocke,* still defensive in October, quoted a statement by Friedrich Engels that the American people were kept submissive neither by militarism nor by dynasties, but by "two great cartels of politicians."[70] The right-wing Socialists were not inclined to accept advice on matters of political science from an American lecturer, therefore. They also were quick to claim that Wilson's advice was offered for ulterior motives. The nationalistic Hamburg *Echo* (S.P.D.) stated that he sought to continue the war until Germany was powerless, and they rejected his interference in the domestic affiars of the Reich.[71] Max Cohen, S.P.D. writer and Reichstag deputy, wrote that Wilson was wrong in his assumption that Germany would be weakened by democratization; the very opposite effect was to be expected.[72]

Most of the usually more moderate S.P.D. newspapers reacted much the same as the right-wing Socialists. The Leipzig *Freie Presse* announced the confirmation of its fears that the Pope's effort would be refused by "Wilson, the autocrat of America." The President had demanded German democratization as a prerequisite for the attainment of permanent peace, but democracy had not kept France, Great Britain, or the United States out of the war. Wilson's demand, therefore, must be rejected "as an illusion and . . . a presumption." Democratization of the Reich, while indispensable, was Germany's own problem.[73] Wilson's note deserved the same kind of laughter that would have been given a German declaration of readiness for peace, "but not with Herr Wilson."[74] The *Fränkische Tagespost* of Nuremberg (S.P.D.) thought it ironical that Wilson's statements could have been made by the head of a nation that had once made

[69] A. Runde, "Demokratie," *Die Glocke,* III (September 1, 1917), 845-858.

[70] "Nochmals Engels an Wilson," *ibid.* (October 20, 1917), p. 106.

[71] Hamburg *Echo,* September 1, 8, 1917, as quoted in Hartwig Koch, *Die Hamburger sozialistische Presse im Weltkrieg* (Elmshorn, 1929), p. 140. Cf. also *Sozialistische Monatshefte,* XXIII (September 12, 1917), 936. The men who expressed their views in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* (e.g., Joseph Bloch, Ludwig Quessel, Max Schippel, and Max Cohen) regarded England and the United States as the greatest enemies of Germany, hoped for peace with Russia, and desired the creation of a German-led continental bloc to oppose Anglo-American *Weltpolitik.*

[72] Max Cohen, "Der Reichstag und die Oestlichen Fragen," *Sozialistische Monatshefte,* XXIII (September 26, 1917), 1028-1033.

[73] Leipzig *Freie Presse,* September 3, 1917.

[74] *Ibid.,* September 7, 1917.

"non-intervention of any foreign state in the affairs of a whole continent" its highest principle of foreign policy. Such utterances could hardly aim at creating a republic in Germany, considering the number of monarchs among the President's allies. The struggle for democracy in Germany would be continued "in spite of Herr Wilson's more than tactless meddling," the *Tagespost* concluded.[75]

All these remarks are not surprising, in view of the general climate of opinion in Germany. But it is both remarkable and significant that the President's note received considerable positive response along with the criticism it stirred up. The Munich *Post* pointed out that Wilson wanted a peace without annexations and that in this respect he was in agreement with "Germany, Austria-Hungary and the Pope."[76] The Leipzig *Freie Presse* demanded that the German government reply to the President, stressing the principles of the July Resolution ("apparently unknown to Wilson"). The American President should be reminded that the German Empire wanted no conquests, renounced war indemnities, would support international arrangements for the maintenance of peace, and would agree to universal disarmament.[77] A few S.P.D. newspapers echoed Wilson's assertion that internal reform in Germany was a necessary prerequisite for peace. The Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung* even remarked that if democracy should triumph in Germany as a consequence of the war, at least some good might have been derived from the struggle.[78] Complete parliamentarization in Germany would enable her government to find more points of contact with her enemies.[79] When criticized for its stand, the Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung* stated that it would not deny facts simply because Wilson had referred to them. This was not the mission of democracy and its press.[80]

Friedrich Stampfer, editor of the S.P.D. central organ *Vorwärts*, was already disillusioned by Michaelis, and he gave Wilson's note one of the most favorable editorials it received in Germany. Stampfer

[75] Quoted in *Daily Review of the Foreign Press; Enemy Press Supplement* (Great Britain, General Staff), September 13, 1917.

[76] *Ibid.*

[77] Leipzig *Freie Presse*, September 3, 1917. For similar comment cf. Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, September 3, 1917.

[78] Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, September 3, 1917.

[79] *Ibid.*, September 10, 1917.

[80] *Ibid.*, September 17, 1917.

was pleased by Wilson's statement that the United States wanted no retribution from the German people, who had not wanted the war. *Vorwärts* thought that the American government owed proof for its assertion that it was not fighting the German people, especially by a renunciation of any intention to demand economic retribution. On this point Wilson had been vague. But his note had been clear in its refusal to deal with the German government, and in its demand for guarantees of the will of the German people. "A certain part of the German press will hasten to assert that it would be unworthy of the German people to give such security. On the contrary, we think that it would be unworthy of it to refuse," declared *Vorwärts*. The S.P.D. journal contended that the German people did not fight for "the rights of single families," but rather for their own existence. While Social Democracy refused to weaken the defensive strength of the country, it would not give up its efforts for constitutional reform.

Governments everywhere were responsible to the people and, said Stampfer, this should be the same in Germany. He wrote:

> The government of a country making war upon us has the right to desire that the people themselves assume responsibility for the conditions under which peace is to be concluded. . . . The American government announces its fundamental willingness to negotiate with authorized representatives of the will of the German people. . . . The authorized representative of the German people is the German Reichstag, which is chosen on the basis of a democratic electoral franchise.

The only thing lacking was ministerial responsibility to the Reichstag, the S.P.D. organ asserted. Should Germany let it be said after the war that the enemy refused to negotiate with her because she was a "nation of helots, incapable of bringing about the acceptance of their own will"? The German Reichstag should recognize the role for which it was predestined. "Indeed, this Reichstag has never wanted power! But now it must want it, because its employer, the German people, desire it of it, and because its way to power is the way to world peace!"[81] Thus was *Vorwärts* spurred by Wilson's answer to the Pope to intensify its campaign for internal reform. For this paper, at least, the craving for democratic reform was "strong enough to

[81] Berlin *Vorwärts*, September 1, 1917.

overcome the nationalist *amour propre* which was wounded by Wilson's plain speaking."[82]

A fratricidal feud followed between Friedrich Stampfer and the ultra-patriotic Socialist, Ernst Heilmann. Heilmann denied reactionary charges that German Socialists had taken Wilson's cue. Writing in his own *Internationale Korrespondenz* he asserted: "Simply and solely *Vorwärts* has placed itself on the side of Wilson." Stampfer answered that this was a police denunciation, and reminded Heilmann of his own previous field service as proof of his patriotism.[83] There are few more patent illustrations of the 1914-1918 victory of nationalism over internationalism than this tragi-comic, inconclusive debate of 1917. Stampfer received definite if unintended support from the usually opportunistic Philipp Scheidemann, who remarked upon the similarity of the views of the Reichstag Resolution and the note of Wilson, and asserted that no more bloodshed was necessary for the attainment of these mutual aims. Scheidemann optimistically remarked that the best guarantee for peace, a democratized Germany, was already being created and that progress would be more rapid if the war could be ended soon. The conclusion of peace would signify the dawn of "democracy and assured peace for the entire world," the Social Democratic leader prophesied.[84]

Independent Socialist reaction to Wilson was, like that of the parent party, heterogeneous. Eduard Bernstein best expressed the attitude of those Independents who were more interested in peace than in the intensification of class struggle. He pointed out that Wilson's note might be interpreted as a call for the deposition of the Hohenzollerns; that at any rate it demanded a radical revision of governmental life in Germany. This prompted Bernstein to examine at length the central problem for Social Democracy in Wilson's message, that of the right of other countries to interfere in the internal affairs of a single nation. The leading exponent of pre-war "Revisionism" stated that the unlimited independence of states was "just as unreconcilable with the Socialist conception of society as unlimited individual freedom." The assumptions upon which President Wilson based his demands might well be questioned, but his right to make them could not be contested. Nations had as much right to punish

[82] Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
[83] Berlin *Vorwärts*, September 3, 1917.
[84] Reported on September 9, 1917, *ibid.*

collectively a disturber of international peace as they had separately to take protective measures against individuals within their borders. Bernstein concluded that Wilson had "expressed the mind of the nations at war with Germany," and he acknowledged that these constituted three-fourths of the civilized world. The interference in German domestic affairs was not to be regarded as unilateral dictation, but as "the formulation by the civilized nations of a majority resolution containing the necessary prerequisites for future peaceful international relations." Wilson's note was an ultimatum to the German people: they could democratize themselves, and receive an early peace such as that proposed by the Pope, or the war would continue until complete exhaustion resulted. German democratization would not absolutely rule out the possibility of future wars, wrote Bernstein, but it would be an essential step in that direction. It was the duty of Social Democracy to use its strength for the attainment of this aim.[85]

Toward Wilson's reply to the Pope, the Leipzig *Volkszeitung* was, as usual, distrustful in a class conscious way of the motives of the bourgeois statesman, and quickly indicated that the note effectively eliminated the possibility of an early peace. Whether or not Wilson believed his own statements the Leipzig *Volkszeitung* did not know, but it asserted that in any event such utterances impressed world opinion. Millions of citizens in the United States and within the Entente believed the claim that a genuine peace could only be concluded with a democratized Germany. If democratization would remove an obstacle to the attainment of peace there was certainly no reason to resist it,[86] because it matched the interests of the German people and had been raised by them "long before Wilson's debut."[87] The Leipzig journal by no means agreed that the rejection of Wilson's interference in German affairs entailed the repudiation of the aims for which he stood.

[85] Eduard Bernstein, "Die Sozialdemokratie und die Einmischungsfrage," *Die Neue Zeit*, XXXV (September 28, 1917), 601-608. This was the last issue of *Die Neue Zeit* to appear under the editorial direction of Karl Kautsky who had founded the journal in 1883 and had edited it since that time. Kautsky had joined the U.S.P.D. Since his journal had become the official intellectual periodical of the S.P.D., he was ejected at this time to make way for Heinrich Cunow, a noted right-Socialist, whose views this journal reflected after October, 1917.

[86] Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, September 1, 1917.

The Leipzig *Volkszeitung* had watched the Heilmann-Stampfer feud in bitter humor. *Vorwärts* and Stampfer had been done a dreadful injustice, this leading U.S.P.D. organ grieved facetiously. "As an impartial but deeply moved observer of this battle between heroes," knowing how "to appreciate the sorrow of Friedrich Stampfer," this paper commented that neither he nor *Vorwärts* deserved the treatment they had received. But, the Leipzig organ observed, "The mean world will probably agree that Herr Heilmann is considerably superior to Herr Stampfer in patriotism. Bitter for Herr Stampfer and for the gallant *Vorwärts*."[88] The Leipzig *Volkszeitung,* in registering these developments, was merely carrying out its duty as a chronicler of events. It had "no cause to interfere in this homicidal conflict between the publicity greats of Government Socialism."[89]

The response of the extreme left Socialists was set forth in a light article by Franz Mehring, Socialist historian who was closely affiliated with the *Spartakusbund*. Like Heilmann, the right Socialist, although for opposite reasons, Mehring chided *Vorwärts* and Stampfer for their favorable reaction to Wilson's note. "Herr Wilson is not our man," Mehring wrote. *Vorwärts* should know better than to put its faith in a bourgeois statesman. Once again the Engels passage on the "two great cartels of politicians" was dusted off. Engels would be amazed, Mehring asserted, if he could hear and see how *Vorwärts,* "the ostensible central organ of German Social Democracy," saluted "a Saviour of political democracy," the "tool and spokesman" of one of the two great political cartels that dominated the United States. "Komödie gegen Komödie!" Mehring exclaimed.[90] Mehring's attitude was fairly representative of that of the extreme left Socialists of Germany. A Spartacus letter which circulated during the following winter cautioned that "The most beautiful democratic freedoms of the bourgeois states could constitute in themselves a flexible tool of the most brutal class domination of capitalism. This the United States of North America proves best of all."[91]

[87] *Ibid.*, September 21, 1917.
[88] *Ibid.*, September 3, 1917.
[89] *Ibid.*, September 4, 1917.
[90] *Ibid.*, September 11, 1917.
[91] Document No. 46 in Ernst Meyer (collector), *Spartakus im Kriege: Die illegalen Flugblätter des Spartakusbundes im Kriege* (Berlin, 1927), pp. 195-198. Cf. also Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands (Spartakusbund), *Spartakusbriefe* (Berlin, 1920), pp. 133-139.

Thus, extreme Socialists of both right and left gave Wilson's call to revolution negative responses, the one being indignantly nationalistic, and the other ungraciously proletarian. Only a few leading Socialist publicists and party officers, more or less in the center of the whole Socialist spectrum in Germany, condoned Wilson's demand for the democratization of Germany. Most receptive were Bernstein of the U.S.P.D. and Stampfer among the Social Democrats. It is indicative of the emotions evoked by the President's reply that for weeks after its publication in Germany it was still causing dissension. When the Reichstag convened in plenary session on September 26, for the first time since the Pope's appeal, Georg Ledebour (U.S.P.D.) called for an examination through immediate discussion of the diplomatic developments that had ensued, especially of the Wilson note, about which, he said, "only entirely one-sided and most controvertible discussions" had hitherto appeared. He was cheered by cries of "Quite true!" by the Independent Socialists, but his plea for a "fundamental examination" in "speech and counter-speech" resulted only in the wholesale denunciation of Wilson's intervention in German affairs.[92] As late as December, 1917, Wilson's note was still the source of ill will in Germany. The anti-Socialist, chauvinistic journalist, Count Ernst von Reventlow, asserted that Scheidemann had influenced Wilson's answer, and *Vorwärts* came to Scheidemann's rescue with finer sarcasm than the basis of fact actually afforded. It informed the count that he was, indeed, on the right trail but he had not disclosed everything. The S.P.D. organ advised Count Reventlow "under strictest discretion" that "The speeches and messages of Wilson are composed in Berlin by the Social Democratic Executive Committee and are cabled by the representatives of the 'Associated Press' from here to Washington, where Wilson is only responsible for signing them, mostly unread."[93]

Had the penman of this piece realized that a good bit of his irony was retroflexive he might have attacked the count in a different manner, or have chosen to maintain silence. Not only had the President himself considered the impact of his message upon the Socialists; as soon as possible, American observers of the European scene rushed to Washington their summaries of German reaction

[92] *Verhandlungen des Reichstags,* CCCX (September 26, 1917), 2618-2619; *ibid.* (October 9, 1917), p. 3809; *ibid.* (October 10, 1917), pp. 3822, 3830, 3837.
[93] Berlin *Vorwärts,* December 16, 1917.

to the note. First German press comment appeared on September 1 and by midnight of September 2 a report from Marshall Langhorne, chargé d'affaires in the Netherlands, was received in the Department of State in Washington. One-third of the published version of this report, which reviewed the comment of nine representative German newspapers, was devoted to the summary of only one of them—*Vorwärts*.[94] Other reports followed from United States legations in Denmark and Switzerland. A review of Scheidemann's reaction, published in Berlin on September 9, was available in Washington on September 11.[95] Although the reports showed that the President's invitation to revolution had been spurned by the German leftists, they indicated that it had, indeed, created the confusion that had been hoped for. The chargé in Switzerland wired on September 29: "The President's reply . . . has had a great effect in the better as well as in the lower German circles where the true text is known. Great unrest among the working classes is causing the German government very great anxiety."[96] In another respect the note had a large measure of particularly noteworthy success: as a "red herring" across the papal path toward peace it shifted the field of attack from its negative aspect of refusal to its positive feature, the call for democracy. This is quite possibly what Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd had in mind when they called the reply "a masterpiece of diplomacy."[97]

Despite some suggestions that Wilson's note might have been intended to lead to new peace efforts,[98] it was planned and accepted in Germany at the time as a veto of peace suggestions, as has been

[94] Marshall Langhorne, chargé in the Netherlands, to the Secretary of State, September 2, 1917, *Foreign Relations, 1917*, Supp. 2, I, 183-186.

[95] Maurice Francis Egan, minister to Denmark, to the Secretary of State, September 10, 1917, *ibid.*, p. 199. On September 21, 1917, the first of a long series of reports by Hugh Wilson, new chargé in Switzerland, was dispatched to Washington. *Ibid.*, p. 210. For Hugh Wilson's account of his wartime experiences cf. his interesting volume, *The Education of a Diplomat* (London, New York and Toronto, 1938).

[96] Hugh Wilson, chargé in Switzerland, to the Secretary of State, September 29, 1917, *Foreign Relations, 1917*, Supp. 2, I, 216-217.

[97] Baker and Dodd, *op. cit.*, V, xxxv. H. J. T. Johnson in his short account seems to have missed completely the significance of Wilson's efforts to arouse the German left. "What," he asks, "could more firmly attach the German people to its Government than the declaration of an enemy that the word of that Government could not be trusted?" Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[98] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-177.

shown. Such it must have seemed to Michaelis, who cannot but have regarded Wilson's note as a real stroke of luck. For obvious reasons he could hardly be expected to admit in a verifiable written source that he subverted the papal appeal after first being cleared of responsibility for its failure by Wilson's refusal to discuss peace. Although the evidence is purely circumstantial, it appears that this is what happened.

After the American reply of August 27 the German chancellor no longer needed to fear hedging on the principles set forth by Benedict XV. His treatment of the papal effort underwent a change at just about this time. Whereas he had earlier been frank and conciliatory, he now adopted the policy that contributed to the refusal of Germany to give an unlimited promise to restore Belgium, one of the key problems in the Pope's list of issues. On August 30 Archbishop Pacelli informed Michaelis that this was the main concern of England and France, and asked for a specific pledge that Germany would restore and make compensation to Belgium.[99] Michaelis did not tell the Reichstag committee of this communication,[100] and he delayed his answer to the nuncio, although one had been requested.

While the significance of this failure on the part of Michaelis has long been recognized, the reason for his action has not been explained satisfactorily. Both the anti-Catholicism of Michaelis[101] and the possibility of negotiations with England through Madrid[102] have been suggested as factors prompting him to sabotage the appeal of Benedict XV. But it is, indeed, "unnecessary to attribute his sabotage of the Papal peace efforts to his ardent Protestantism,"[103] and equally unnecessary to attribute it to the choice of Spain rather than the Vatican as a mediator. A more logical conclusion is that Michaelis was confident he would not be blamed for the failure of the papal efforts; that he was, furthermore, in agreement with the military and naval high command that an unlimited promise to restore Belgium was not desirable;[104] that the Reichstag committee members, except

[99] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 224; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

[100] On the German answer to the Pope cf. Ludendorff, *The General Staff and Its Problems*, II, 487-507; Scheidemann, *The Making of New Germany*, II, 55-56; Michaelis, *op. cit.*, pp. 338-341; Gatzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-225.

[101] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 ff.; 303.

[102] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-224.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[104] Cf. Gatzke, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-232; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-241.

for Scheidemann and Ebert, were won to this point of view, although they realized the importance of Belgium without being reminded by the papal nuncio's note of August 30;[105] that, to avoid seeming to block the peace movement, the hope of peace through Spanish mediation was held out to the committee members who most desired a statement on Belgium, namely, Scheidemann and Ebert.[106] That the S.P.D. members suspected such tactics is indicated by their persistence on the question of Belgium.[107] In the end they were overridden, and when the German government finally answered the Pope on September 19 no mention of Belgium was included amidst the many peaceful generalities.[108] When, after being prompted Michaelis answered Pacelli's letter of August 30 it was to state that an immediate pledge regarding Belgium would not be made.[109]

Most Social Democrats had expected a specific declaration on Belgium, and were disappointed that this was not forthcoming. Otherwise their reaction to the reply was favorable.[110] The U.S.P.D., in contrast, pointed out immediately the failure of the German note.[111] But it was a domestic matter, not the peace issue, which caused the Social Democrats and the other parties of the Reichstag majority to turn against Michaelis. Government accusations that Independent Socialist Reichstag deputies had promoted mutinies in the German fleet brought about surprising solidarity of Social Democrats, Independent Socialists, Progressives, and some Center deputies against the chancellor. Fritz Ebert declared that such action could only have been taken by a government which was "unconscious of its great responsibility and unequal to its high and important task. . . . I say openly: we shall welcome each day that will bring us closer to the liberation of the German people from this government."[112] The Leipzig *Volkszeitung* on October 11 referred to Michaelis as "A dead

[105] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-204.

[106] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 224; Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-199.

[107] Lama, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-203.

[108] For the text of the German draft cf. *ibid.*, p. 226-228.

[109] *Ibid.*, pp. 271-273.

[110] Cf. Scheidemann, *The Making of New Germany*, II, 52; Scheidemann, *Papst, Kaiser und Sozialdemokratie*, p. 4; Berlin *Vorwärts*, September 6, 18, 22, 1917; Friedrich Ebert, *Schriften, Aufzeichnungen, Reden, mit unveröffentlichten Erinnerungen aus dem Nachlass*, 2 vols. (Dresden, 1926), II, 28-29; Bremen *Bürger-Zeitung*, September 22, 1917; Leipzig *Freie Presse*, September 22, 1917.

[111] Leipzig *Volkszeitung*, September 22, 26, 29, 1917.

[112] Cf. Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

man."[113] Michaelis, with no assistance except from the Conservatives,[114] was eased out of office at the end of October, and replaced by a South German Catholic who was more inclined toward parliamentary procedure, Georg von Hertling.

Because the Reichstag leaders had played a considerable part in bringing about the change, it was welcomed as a step toward ministerial responsibility. The Chemnitz *Volksstimme* (S.P.D.) on November 3 referred to the change as a "German revolution." When *Vorwärts* on November 9 reported the Bolshevik revolution in Russia it proudly proclaimed: "Violent revolution in Russia, peaceful revolution in Germany, this is the order of the day." But the new chancellor refused just as obstinately as had Michaelis the demands of the Socialists for an unambiguous statement on Belgium, even when prodded by Wilson in January and February, 1918.[115]

In 1917, at least for a brief season, the concept of sovereign, unilateral, national interest, ultimately achieved through war, was challenged. In the statements of the Pope, Wilson, and the Socialists, three forms of internationalism were distinguishable, representative of three epochs through which the idea of "one world" has passed. The papal internationalism of the Middle Ages, the "bourgeois" concept that originated during the Enlightenment and survived the French Revolution, and the ideal set forth by nineteenth-century Marxism—"working men of all countries, unite!"—all these were brought into an atonal attack against the idea that international conflicts must be fought to a finish. The schizophrenic dilemma of nineteenth-century liberalism transferred into a century of warfare, torn between the desire for national welfare and international harmony, was personalized in Wilson's predicament. His attempted solution was to strive for international peace, but on his own terms. On his behalf it must be said that he correctly believed the German government to be opposed to all three varieties of international idealism.

[113] Cf. also *ibid.*, October 10, 1917. The progress of the October political crisis and its solution was summarized in a report on the Central Powers drawn up by Joseph C. Grew for the Secretary of State, and submitted by Secretary Robert Lansing to Wilson on November 12, 1917. Library of Congress, Woodrow Wilson Papers.

[114] Michaelis, *op. cit.*, pp. 366-369.

[115] Cf. my article, "Wilson's Peace Program and German Socialism, January-March, 1918," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, September, 1951.

Because he saw this, he refused to consider peace with Michaelis on the terms offered by the Pope and agreed to by the German socialists. The combined result of Wilson's refusal, the lack of power of the Papacy, the possession of power by those who directed German policy, and the refusal of German Socialists to seize that power, was the triumph of nationalism. By November 1, 1917, the peace efforts of Pope Benedict XV had failed; Michaelis had fallen; German Socialists were more closely united to their government than they had been for over a year; and Wilson was more than ever before the moral leader of the Allied peoples. "The abuse which the Entente press had a few months earlier heaped upon Mr Wilson was now replaced by abject sycophancy and a chorus of voices acclaimed the ex-President of Princeton as a Messiah destined to inaugurate a world-wide democratic millennium."[116] The carnage continued.

Michaelis has been blamed for the failure of Benedict XV, and justly so. But the fault was not all his. Wilson's reply enabled Michaelis to handle the situation as he did. The only scholarly generalization that can be reached under these circumstances is that "neither the Allies nor Germany were ready and in a desperate enough military position to be wholeheartedly in favor of returning to the absolute *status quo ante bellum.*"[117] Nor was this situation to be reached during the remainder of the war. When the German high command admitted the necessity of peace, after the failure of their 1918 efforts to win it on the battlefield, they were to ask for it on the basis of principles even more unfavorable to them than those of the Pope which they had spurned in 1917. And when the imperial government proved too slow in accepting the terms drawn up by the American President, German Marxists cast aside their prudence and carried through a revolution which they understandably supposed to be in accordance with the wishes of Woodrow Wilson. Their revolution was relatively non-violent, moderate in its domestic aims, and western rather than Russian in its orientation. Above all it was national. All these characteristics and, perhaps, the revolution itself, were presaged by the developments reviewed above. The events of

[116] Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 33. Wilson's answer not only made it easier for Michaelis to hedge on the papal principles but his quick reply also relieved the allied governments of responsibility for the failure of the Pontiff's peace move.

[117] Gatzke, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

1917 may thus be considered as a prologue to the more poignant drama played out in Germany after October 3, 1918, and as one of the more complex, although unsuccessful, efforts to solve international disputes through appeal to reason—or faith—rather than through mass annihilation.

University of Wichita

BOOK REVIEWS

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

White Magic. An Introduction to the Folklore of Christian Legend. By C. Grant Loomis. (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1948. Pp. 250. $5.00.)

This book is a very valuable collection of an enormous amount of widely scattered material. It is classified conveniently under the following chapter heads: I The Wonder Child; II The Four Elements; III The Senses; IV Animals; V Divine Foresight and Knowledge; VI Power over Matter; VII Transportation; VIII Miraculous Growth; IX Taboos and Punishments; X Healing; XI Popular Legends and White Magic; XII Miscellanea. Items have been gleaned from the lives of nearly 1800 saints and exact references are furnished in the closely packed notes at the end of the book. The great majority of the items, naturally, come from the *Acta Sanctorum,* but a number of other collections were also utilized.

The work, in spite of the monumental labor which it has entailed and of its obvious value, has certain shortcomings which must not be ignored. The author rejects, apparently, all belief in the reality or possibility of genuine miracles in the strict theological sense. Hence his term, white magic, is employed in an all-inclusive way to signify any benevolent manifestation or use whatever of supernatural power—real, legendary, or imaginary. To quote his own words: "We shall survey the realm of the white magician, of the willer to good, of the saints and of the good men of the Christian world." . . . "The attachment of miracles to the progenitors of Christianity was a rather slow process, despite the records of benevolent magic in the *Gospels* and in the *Old Testament*" (p. 7). Furthermore, although this would seem necessary, he does not deal in his introduction with the saint's life in Antiquity or in the Middle Ages as a formal literary genre with its own principles and conventions. Had he consulted the standard monographs of the great Bollandist, H. Delehaye—none are mentioned—or the articles "Miracle," and "Magie," e.g., in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* he would have been able to grasp more precisely the character and content of ancient and mediaeval biography, and to distinguish more sharply between the Christian and non-Christian elements which are intermingled in this genre.

A few comments on particular points. P. 8: the Bollandists will be surprised to read that they have been primarily concerned with collecting legends and that they have ceased printing since the first World War. P. 10: the bibliography given in footnote 1 is now antiquated, being com-

pletely replaced by the monographs of Delehaye and others. P. 135: the *Analecta Bollandiana* did not cease publication in 1922, but is still flourishing after World War II. The supplement (1911) to the *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina* is not mentioned, and the *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca* and *Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis* are not listed at all. The volumes devoted to lives of the saints in the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* should be listed and reference made to them in the notes. Pp. 133-134: considering the great wealth of material brought together and the rich possibilities—and need—of final summary and general evaluation, the conclusion presented is quite inadequate in every respect.

The book, despite the shortcomings mentioned, is a mine of information and a very valuable tool for further research in legend and folklore.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

The Catholic University of America

The Other World according to Descriptions in Medieval Literature. By Howard Rollin Patch. [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, New Series. Vol. I.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 386. $6.00.)

The author definitely states his purpose as the examination of certain mediaeval documents—particularly French, English, and Italian—to trace as far as possible in allegory, romance, and didactic treatises the sources of the ideas concerning the geography of the other world, in an effort to "identify the chief outlines of their background in folklore." The volume represents a comprehensive investigation of the theme in the literatures of many peoples. It points out the other-world scene designated by images of the heavenly city in the skies, the Isles of the Blessed, the Pied Piper's country inside the mountain, the garden on the mountain top, the realm under the earth or under the sea. Through an enumeration of certain geographical motifs—the island, the hill, the mountain, the river, and other familiar scenic patterns—Professor Patch advances notions concerning paradise that are characteristic of oriental and classical mythologies which, in turn, find resurgence in folklore and reappear in European vernacular literatures during the Middle Ages.

Those professionally engaged in mediaeval studies as well as advanced students of comparative literatures and of comparative religions undoubtedly will find *The Other World* an indispensable addition to their personal reference library. They will travel knowingly with him through oriental and classical literatures, tracing in them possible origins of the other-world theme. There are points of similarity between the classical and the Celtic ideas. The motifs are marked also "with strong differences from the

equivalents in Greek and Roman mythology, and show with intensity the play of Celtic fantasy which gives their accounts highly individualized characteristics." The fairy mound of Celtic lore has little identity with the rocky fell or craggy mountain described in Germanic mythology. A dire atmosphere seems to penetrate the other-world land of the *Eddas*. "Much of the detail of our study of the older religions," Mr. Patch says, "comes from the documents which were written after faith had departed and the significant features retained only an imaginative or poetic value for the writer who set them down."

Judging from commentaries of the Church fathers and the mediaeval encyclopedists, from other-world material in the *chansons de geste*, and from descriptions in Dante's *Purgatorio* and in *Mandeville's Travels*, the Garden of Eden was universally believed to exist, frequently associated with an earthly paradise. Although it might be "exalted by a mountain to a higher level, it is not strange that travelers went in search of it, and it was inevitable that stories should be told of their occasional success." This does the author recount in Chapter V, "Journeys to Paradise." Professor Patch's observations on the other-world motifs in the chapters on visions, allegory, and the romances are reminiscent of the wide scholarship he has exhibited in his other studies. From the Pahlavi *Book of the Arda Viraf* to the *Legend of Saint Patrick's Purgatory*, in these and in the thirty-five actual narratives of vision the same features of the realm after death suggest biblical or apocryphal sources, or even a possible indebtedness to the folktale or popular rumor. As Mr. Patch discusses the mysterious and enchanted other-world in allegory and romance he accumulates an imposing amount of evidence to acquaint his reader with "the very considerable use of material from the East, transmitted by the visions perhaps or even by Celtic stories or other documents, in the whole field of mediaeval allegory and romance." It would seem that the author had realized the aim of his investigation of other-world motifs in mediaeval literature—"to see whether any dependable conclusions are beginning to emerge so that other investigators may have something of a guide to assist them from this point on."

Although *The Other World* is apparently intended for the scholarly adult, the undergraduate, selecting the book from a list of suggested readings on the Middle Ages, might summarily lay the book aside with the comment that it only leads the reader through a heaven of carefuly selected visions, through a purgatory of vague allusions and a swamp of footnotes, and through a hell of the burdensome language of Latin, French, English, German, and Italian dictionaries. He may rejoice at meeting such familiar names as Robert Browning, Sir James Barrie, Thornton Wilder, James Hilton, and T. S. Eliot, yet at the same time wonder at Mr. Patch's textual digression from mediaeval authors. He might label

the book "uninteresting." In this connection the author admits that when one account is followed by another in which there is "such a profusion of detail, however, it cannot be denied that an element of monotony creeps in almost inevitably from the sheer fact of repetition." But when the student has become initiated in certain linguistic intricacies of mediaeval research and has need of guidance in interpreting the works of Dante, Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton he is likely to turn to Professor Patch's *The Other World*. Then he will value its forty-one pages of bibliography; then will he wish that the index were complete.

SISTER MARY JEROME KISHPAUGH

Siena Heights College

Eleanor of Aquitaine. By Curtis Howe Walker. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1950. Pp. xiv, 274. $5.00.)

Eleanor of Aquitania, one of the most fascinating and well-known women of the Middle Ages, continues to find admiring biographers. Two studies of her came out in 1950, one by Amy Kelly and the other by Professor Walker of Vanderbilt. Of the two Amy Kelly's *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings*, a really grand book, with its deep understanding of the twelfth century, is easily the better. Professor Walker's volume by comparison, is a more superficial effort. The author who covers the whole career of the great queen gives us a biography in which all the dialogues and some of the speeches are "imaginative reconstructions." The superficial and external aspects of the period are described in a lively and interesting fashion but the author seems to lack a deep historical knowledge of the whole background, or at least does not care to develop it so as to furnish a rich and realistic setting for Eleanor. One has only to compare the pages on courtly love in Miss Kelly's work with those of Professor Walker's to have an example of this.

Although based on extensive research one finds no important discoveries concerning the well known career of Eleanor. Both books seem to agree on the high points of her marriage, annulment, the crusading adventure, her imprisonment, etc. There are disagreements, however, on certain details. Miss Kelly is inclined, e.g., to implicate Eleanor in the decision to alter Louis' orders to encamp at the foot of the Cadmos Mountains while they were en route to Jerusalem. Professor Walker implies that Eleanor disapproved the decision but felt things had gone too far to reverse the decision already taken by the leaders of the van. Further on when the royal couple are returning from the crusade, Professor Walker has Louis rescued from the Greeks by the timely intervention of the ships of Roger of Sicily; Miss Kelly has Louis on one of Roger's ships at the time the

Greek navy arrives to force Louis to return to Constantinople. These are, however, not points of great importance. The explanatory notes accompanying Professor Walker's work help the reader to see the basis of his interpretation of texts, an advantage Miss Kelly's book lacks. The work is very ably illustrated by M. S. Nowicki and beautifully printed. It is sure to furnish an entertaining evening's reading.

JAMES A. CORBETT

University of Notre Dame

Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings. By Amy Kelly. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 431. $5.00.)

This biographical study by a former associate professor at Wellesley College merits the attention of the historian and of the general reader. To the historian the outline and many details of the story are familiar: the marriage of Eleanor and Louis Capet; the disastrous Second Crusade; the dissolution of the marriage of Eleanor and Louis and her subsequent marriage to Henry of Normandy; the forging of the Angevin Empire; the conflict between Henry II and Thomas Becket; the court of Eleanor at Poitiers; her imprisonment; the quarrels of Henry and his sons; the succession of Richard and the re-emergence of Eleanor; the crusade of Richard; dynastic problems centering about John Lackland and Arthur of Brittany; the death of Eleanor.

To compress this story into 387 pages presented problems of selection and development which, on the whole, Miss Kelly has solved admirably. Her study is one of individuals rather than of any aspect of the institutions of the period. In the delineation of such personalities as Louis VII, Henry II, Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard, Thomas Becket, Miss Kelly has been strikingly successful. Material gleaned from the chronicles has been employed with dramatic effect: as, the glories of Byzantium viewed through the eyes of the crusaders (pp. 42-44); the elation of the populace of Paris on the occasion of the birth of an heir to Louis VII (p. 129); the episodes at Henry's courts at Bures (p. 147) and at Caen (pp. 210-211). The emphasis is political and social. A fuller treatment of other aspects would have clarified certain issues, e.g., a statement of the canons of the Church for a valid marriage in connection with several marriages, that of Eleanor and Louis in particular.

Eleanor's role, in the opinion of Miss Kelly, was that of a "binder," bringing diverse elements together and into relation. The central figure for approximately the first half of the book, the queen yields place to Henry in the third quarter, regaining a dominant position at the accession of Richard. By following the chronicles which designate Poitiers rather

than Fontevrault as the place of her death, Eleanor's story comes full circle, which permits Miss Kelly to review, as through Eleanor's waning consciousness, the persons, places, and events significant in her life.

The format of the book is attractive, the decorative end papers by Dr. Irwin Raicz useful, the photographic illustrations appropriate, the literary style vivid and distinctive. The text is accompanied by notes, bibliography, and a serviceable index. The nine-page bibliography, devoted chiefly to source materials, omits titles which one would expect to find, despite Miss Kelly's acknowledgment of her indebtedness to secondary works. Additional maps, especially for the crusades, diagrams, and a genealogical table would have been valuable. The appearance of *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings* on best-seller lists of non-fiction indicates that this work has found favor with the general reader. The book is good literature; it is also sound history.

ANNA T. SHEEDY

College of New Rochelle

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Nationalism and Internationalism. Essays Inscribed to Carlton J. H. Hayes. Edited by Edward Meade Earle. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xvii, 510. $5.75.)

To the student of modern European history no name is more familiar than that of Carlton J. H. Hayes. As the author of several widely-used textbooks, as a teacher at Columbia University, and as a pioneer authority on the rise and significance of modern nationalism, he has influenced the study of history as have few others. Not only has his own work greatly shaped the teaching of European history, but the hundreds of students who have been privileged to study under his direction have carried his ideas and methods far and wide. It is altogether fitting, then, that on the occasion of his retirement from his long teaching career at Columbia a group of Professor Hayes' former students should have prepared and dedicated to him as a *Festschrift* this present volume of essays.

Under the editorship of Professor Edward Meade Earle of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, whose introduction honors the career of Professor Hayes, such an array of scholarship has been assembled as to preclude any critical analysis of individual essays. Appropriately enough, the theme of nationalism runs through all of them. Several of the contributors have chosen to deal with personalities. Frances Childs writes of Citizen Hauterive, republican secret agent in America; Jesse Clarkson describes a contemporary Irish nationalist, "Big Jim" Larkin; Charles Cole presents an excellent appraisal of the influence of Hegel on

Sombart, Spengler, and Heckscher; Edward Meade Earle offers a noteworthy study of H. G. Wells as the British patriot earnestly seeking a world state; John Gazley writes an interesting account of Arthur Young and his voluminous writings; Thomas Peardon indicates Sir John Seeley's prophetic realization of the United States and Russia as the super-powers of the future; William O. Shanahan presents Friedrich Naumann who correctly estimated the grip of nationalism on the working class, and Glyndon Van Deusen appraises Horace Greeley as an American nationalist.

In a different vein are Jacques Barzun's "Cultural Nationalism and the Makings of Fame," which analyzes France's long delay in accepting Berlioz as her great romantic composer, and Robert Ergang's account of Klopstock's influence upon a cultural and romantic German nationalism. Walter Langsam presents a study of William II's program of teaching patriotism through history in the Prussian schools.

The workings of nationalism in specific areas are presented in four essays. Beatrice Hyslop has done much to open the almost neglected field of Jacobin efforts in Spain; John Rath shows how Italian opinion in Lombardy-Venetia turned against the Austrian "liberators" in 1814, and John Wourinen outlines ably the development of national consciousness in the four Scandinavian countries. Mary Townsend adds to her work in colonial studies an excellent synthesis of the revival of German colonial aspirations under Hitler. The pattern of internationalism appears in Charlotte Muret's study of how the Swiss overcame national differences to achieve federation and in Geroid Robinson's provocative essay on "American Thought and the Communist Challenge."

This reviewer can recommend the volume with enthusiasm. To the student of nationalism it is almost indispensable; other historians will find it very useful and the general reader cannot but profit from it.

EDWARD J. GOODMAN

Xavier University
Cincinnati

Oesterreichische Geschichtschreibung in der Barockzeit (1620-1740). By Anna Coreth. (Wien: Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg. 1950. Pp. iv, 179.)

A young and very gifted Austrian historian has made a thorough study of a period of historiography ignored so far, namely, Austrian historical writing during the age of baroque (1620-1740). The baroque age, indeed a glorious one for Austrian history of which recently a lively presentation has been offered us in the second volume of Professor Hugo Hantsches' *History of Austria* (Graz, 1950), has been a favorite topic for research

in the history of art, music, and literature for quite some time. It has now proved a fertile ground also in the generally uncultivated historiographical field.

After tracing the general background, the author begins by discussing such historical works as centered on the dynasty (the *Casa d'Austria*) and the Austrian monarchy which developed fully to a great power during that age. Historical topics apparently were important to these writers in two ways: the genealogical problem still ranked high as it had been taken up by Maximilian I in order to prove the equality, if not the superiority, of the dynasty in comparison with any other ruling house and in order to buttress its claims to the dignity of Roman emperor, perceived as the ruler of the last universal monarchy. In this group still the political end prevailed over factual research. Around 1680 twenty types could be counted, all concerned with the origins of the Habsburgs to whom either an ancient-Roman or a Trojanic-Frankish or a Swiss ancestry was given (p. 31). Second came the interest in contemporary history, especially since the reign of Leopold I and the deeds of Eugene of Savoy. It is interesting to watch how in this field the study of primary sources developed, albeit under the surveillance of censorship. Equally the background for historical publications grew more favorable with the emperor and his nobles becoming interested in the collecting of books and art treasures, a trend recently well presented by Professor Otto Brunner in his *Adeliges Landleben und Europäischer Geist* (Salzburg, 1949). The ideal Habsburg ruler—according to these historians—was not distinguished by a Machiavellian *virtù*, but by his *pietas;* historical praise was accorded to the legitimate acquisition, not to the masterfully planned (pp. 38 f., 67, 71, 76). Foreshadowing trends of the Romantic school, e.g., Barante, much interest was devoted in these works to detailed descriptions of the great festivities and solemnities which symbolized the major events of a reign including the prince's funeral.

The section of Coreth's book dealing with ecclesiastical historiography probably affords the greatest interest and is also specially well elaborated. The reader might have expected that the great Austrian orders and convents should have taken the leadership in this part of Austrian baroque culture and it was also to be assumed that intellectual influences coming from the centers in France and Belgium would impress themselves on the historiographical activity of the Austrian Benedictines and Jesuits. Still for the first time, to the reviewer's knowledge, we are here presented with a fascinating description of the historiographical activities of Melk and Göttweig, Lilienfeld and the Austrian Jesuits. The development of historical criticism with those writers—coming in the wake of the use of original source material—is carefully traced and in the discussion between Father Pez, O.S.B. and Father Hansiz, S.J. (pp. 102, 104, 108, 120) on

this issue there is already gleaned the contraposition between historicism and the scholastic approach as it would later develop into a climax at the Vatican Council in the polemic between Döllinger-Acton and, on the other side, the Jesuits Perrone and Franzelin. The learned forgeries of Pater Hanthaler ushered in a number of equally learned attempts of Romanticists, very distinct from the *insouciance* for historical facts as exhibited by the court genealogists of the baroque age.

The last section of the book under review discusses the historical writings in the Austrian provinces where again we find some remarkable achievements, such as the Styrian chronicle by the Protestant Preuenhuber who was in the services of the municipality of Steyr, and the great baroque work on Carniola by Johann von Valvasor living the life of a gentleman scholar on his estates.

The years 1949-1950 which brought forth the volumes of Otto Brunner, Hugo Hantsch, Anna Coreth, and the first part of Srbik's historiography have certainly been fruitful ones for Austria's historical writing.

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

The Catholic University of America

The Jacobite Movement. The First Phase, 1688-1716. By Sir Charles Petrie. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1948; New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. xii, 240. $3.50.)

Not many years ago Hilaire Belloc asserted in his characteristically brusque but fundamentally accurate manner, "Almost all the historical work worth doing at the present time in the English language is the work of shovelling off heaps of rubbish inherited from the immediate past." In the gigantic task of purging from the record of British history the accretions of Protestant and parliamentarian bias produced by writers of the Whig school, few scholars have made more significant contributions to the cause of truth and objectivity than Sir Charles Petrie.

The present study in the author's favorite era of the Stuart rulers and pretenders is an expansion of the first part of his book on the Jacobite movement which appeared nearly two decades ago. Several valid considerations have prompted an enlargement of his treatment of the period extending from the "Glorious Revolution" to the end of the uprising of 1715. Chief among these are the immense amount of source material recently made available and the recognized necessity of showing to what extent the constantly changing mosaic of international politics affected the movement and was in turn affected by it. Not only does Petrie utilize the new documentary evidence with care and skill, but he justly castigates neo-Whigs who continue to perpetrate the cardinal historical sin of

"Froudacity." A striking illustration of the latter (p. 29) is Winston Churchill's account of the wreck of the *Gloucester* in which the former prime minister attributes the resulting great loss of life to the obstinacy and callousness of Duke James (II) on the flimsy basis of a letter written some sixty years after the event by the Duchess of Marlborough, though several reliable, eye-witness accounts completely exonerate the man who was soon to become the last Stuart monarch. On the other hand, there is no attempt to minimize the high-handedness and rashness of Charles I's younger son. In fact, Petrie's portrait of James II is one of the best and most convincing that has been produced. Only the most stubbornly partisan will take issue with the statement that "The blunders of James made Britain a fiercely Protestant state." In rare instances, however, Petrie does allow his enthusiasm for doing justice to the Stuart cause to carry him beyond the frontiers of available proof. When James fled to France with his family there was no assurance to warrant the apodictic conjecture that, "if the child [subsequently known as the Pretender] had been left behind Parliament would certainly never have passed him over to make a foreigner King of England" (p. 67).

The apparent duplicity of Louis XIV in his wavering efforts to aid the Stuarts in regaining their lost throne is very satisfactorily explained. As a sincerely concerned relative Louis was ready to do everything he could for James and his heirs, but as King of France he was unwilling to go beyond a Stuart restoration in Edinburgh and Dublin, preferring the component parts of the British Isles to remain divided among themselves and consequently too weak to interfere effectively with his designs.

CLARENCE J. RYAN

Marquette University

The Quest for Security, 1715-1740. By Penfield Roberts. Volume VIII of The Rise of Modern Europe, edited by William L. Langer. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1947. Pp. x, 300. $4.00.)

Although the period 1715-1740 has attracted the attention of several eminent historians, it is still probably the most neglected quarter-century of modern history. It has deserved a better fate if only for the lessons it offers in the task of international reconstruction. Moreover, living at a time when men's faith in political progress has been, if not shattered, at least sorely tried, we should be less prone than earlier generations to stress the fumblings and more willing to acknowledge the achievements of the years following the Peace of Utrecht.

Like the eight volumes which preceded it in publication in Professor Langer's series, *The Quest for Security* is a superb blend of scholarly synthesis and keen analysis of European-wide diplomatic, institutional,

economic, and cultural trends. Also, like its predecessors, it possesses a flavor of its own. Whereas Professors Binkley and Hayes focused attention on the mid-nineteenth-century crisis of federative policy and the seeds of twentieth-century totalitarianism respectively, the late Professor Roberts stressed the predominantly traditional character of society in the age of Fleury and Walpole, and the eminently prudential conduct of its statesmen. One of the reasons why the years 1715-1740 were a period of transition (what period, in some way or other, is not?) is that society had escaped considerably from the influence of ideas dominant in earlier periods and yet had not fallen under the spell of those suggested by the word *Enlightenment.*

In considering the balance of power established in the years following the demise of Louis XIV and Sweden's Charles XII, the author rejects the contention of a *prépondérance anglaise.* In the light of more recent studies, it is difficult to see why such a view has been so seriously entertained. Further evidence of Professor Roberts' fine sense of proportion is his rejection of the rather antiquated thesis that France under Louis XV was a tyranny and the not so antiquated one that the Jesuits were responsible for the promulgation of the bull *Unigenitus.* Especially attractive is the chapter, "Resistance to Change," in which he presents a picture of an ordered society cherishing traditional values and in which corporate relationships rather than individuals predominated. While devoting considerable and deserved attention to Locke, he reaches the conclusion that the new spirit attaining greater proportions in the second quarter of the eighteenth century owed more to the influence of Newton, and far more to Descartes than to either of the Englishmen. The statement that Descartes' illusion of innate ideas, rejected by Locke, had also been held by the scholastics should have been, however, at least qualified.

From numerous statements in the volume, one can gain the impression that the author himself was convinced that historically the search for stability was doomed by the rising intellectuals. And yet on occasions he admits the possibility of a different result, e.g., "Had he [Fleury] been immortal, the French Revolution might never have occurred." Meaningless as this observation is to some readers, it ought to be appreciated in an age sadly lacking in statesmen of the calibre of Fleury and Walpole.

A. Paul Levack

Fordham University

Anglophobia in France, 1763-1789. By Frances Acomb. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 167. $4.50.)

Books discussing psychological factors in the relations between France and Great Britain are always timely, and Dr. Acomb, assistant professor

of history in Duke University, has chosen a stirring period in the history of these two nations for analysis. Since other scholars have well expressed the admiration of Frenchmen for English political institutions, Dr. Acomb has preferred to study the character of the resistance within France to these same institutions. A consideration of the intellectual currents in the politics and diplomacy of the last half of the eighteenth century leads her to many interesting observations and conclusions.

For example, the author contributes considerable evidence in support of the French historian, Ernest Lavisse, to the effect that French political nationalism emerged prior to the French Revolution. This is, of course, in contrast to the more recent interpretations of many historians, notably Carlton J. H. Hayes and Hans Kohn. In this respect she emphasizes that nationalism in France should not be associated exclusively with liberal and democratic movements. In fact, it is pointed out that the nationalists at the close of the Seven Years' War were more exactly the conservatives. Dr. Acomb characterizes the French liberals as being Anglophile (in the tradition of Voltaire and Montesquieu) until the War of American Independence. Then, liberal opinion in France (under the influence of Rousseau and the physiocrats, and with the "imperial tyranny" of Great Britain before their eyes) became predominantly Anglophobe. On the other hand, confronted with republican doctrines at home many French conservatives began to view England more sympathetically.

The sources for this study have been limited, presumably, to those available on this side of the Atlantic. However, this need not be a serious handicap since the extensive bibliography alone would indicate Dr. Acomb's diligent preparation. Above all, the merit of this particular work should encourage the publication of companion volumes. There are other decisive epochs in the history of these two great peoples that challenge careful delineation of the psychological factors in their relations.

PAUL L. LOCHER

Georgetown University

British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century: Policies and Speeches. By Joseph Hendershot Park. (New York: New York University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 377. $4.75.)

Dr. Park has conceived the useful idea of compiling an anthology of speeches by British prime ministers of the nineteenth century. The result is a collection of speeches and extracts from speeches occupying some 300 pages with short biographical essays on each of the statesmen concerned. This anthology will certainly prove valuable to both students and teachers, for Hansard, from which most of the passages are taken, is not often

easily accessible—and even when accessible is hardly a manageable work for use in classroom or study. Moreover, existing anthologies of speeches have in general been based too exclusively on the theme of the development of representative institutions, whereas Dr. Park makes his choice from a wide range of subjects, and includes topics as diverse as Catholic Emancipation, the bank charter act, the Irish home rule bill and the housing of the poor—the failures as well as the successes of nineteenth-century statesmanship.

It is difficult, nevertheless, not to feel that Dr. Park's anthology might have been very much better than it is. In the first place its title is a misnomer. It is not a selection from the speeches of the prime ministers of the nineteenth century, but of the last three quarters of the century. Pitt, Perceval, and Liverpool—that important but neglected figure—are all absent. Secondly, the Whig tradition is inadequately represented; of Dr. Park's seven prime ministers, five—Canning, Wellington, Peel, Disraeli, and Salisbury—were Tories throughout their parliamentary careers; the remaining two—Palmerston and Gladstone—changed parties in middle life. Of the Whig-Liberal prime ministers in the generation between the first and second reform acts only Palmerston is included; of the others—Grey, Melbourne, Russell—not one has been granted a place in the editor's selection, which thus does less than justice to an important element in British political life.

Dr, Park's biographical essays are accurate accounts of the chief events in the careers of the seven chosen prime ministers, but they are unsatisfying both in their portrayal of character and in their analysis of ideas. They are hardly likely to stimulate the young historian to further study.

CHRISTOPHER HOWARD

King's College
London

The Neapolitan Revolution of 1820-1821. By George T. Romani. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press. Pp. vii, 190. $4.00.)

Mr. Romani sets out to examine the "true origins, course, and failure" of the Neapolitan revolution. In discussing origins his book makes its most valid contribution, an acute analysis of the Muratists and the Carbonari. Then, focusing on Guglielmo Pepe, he traces the changing relationships between these dominating constitutionalist groups down to the revolution's dismal end. (While Pepe was certainly a key figure, can such a trimmer be called a "hero"?) Yet the essential motivation for the rebels, Bourbon inefficiency and repression, is inadequately treated, as are the personalities of Ferdinand and his enigmatic son. Despite the chance

combination of its reporters and its accidental occasion, the revolution was not "entirely accidental in its origin" (p. 28).

The course of the uprising, particularly in its early turbulence, is graphically depicted. But that course even so early as August, and not simply the collapse after November, was in effect controlled by the great powers, not Carbonari Jacobinism or Muratist muddling. Mr. Romani makes abundantly clear that success did not depend on internal events. But he has slighted the European, even pre-revolutionary causes for failure. Concentrating, perhaps, too closely on Neapolitan sources, he has neglected other diplomatic material, and thus he failed to put the fruitful revelations from the *Atti del Parlamento delle Due Sicilie, 1820-1821* in their proper perspective.

The correlation and comparison that integration of recently published matter with older accounts always demands have here marred the presentation. Content obviously vital to the text must often be sought in footnotes, amid less relevant facts or bibliographical comment (e.g., p. 37 n. 1, p. 94 n. 78). Such lack of discrimination combines with a graceless style to make difficult reading of an unhappy story. An appendix with such pertinent documents as the convention of Casalanza and Pepe's bill of guarantees would also have been welcome.

Nevertheless, to record a revolution that failed commands admiration. For the historian records decline—at Naples not a climax of tragic heroism but an "absurd" and only slightly pathetic unravelling—and may write under the pall of doom. Or he may be tempted to explain failure rather by what could have been but was not done than by what happened. On the other hand, the Neapolitan revolution happened; with the advent of new material it demands re-examination. Therefore, we stand in Mr. Romani's debt. His careful statement of internal Neapolitan affairs has more precisely delineated the roles the Muratists and the Carbonari played in the revolution.

JOHN H. KENNEDY

Washington, D. C.

Epistolario di Nino Bixio. Volume III (*1866-1870*). Edited by Emilia Morelli. [Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano: Biblioteca Scientifica, serie II: fonti. Vol. XXXIV.] (Padua: Officine Grafiche Stediv. 1949. Pp. xvi, 621. L. 2,500.)

Augusto de Liedekerke de Beaufort: Rapporti delle cose di Roma (1848-1849). Edited by Alberto M. Ghisalberti. [Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano: Biblioteca Scientifica: serie II: fonti. Vol. XXXV.] (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico delle Stato—P.V., 1949. Pp. xviii, 212. L. 1,500.)

With the publication of these two volumes (34 and 35 of the second series) the Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano has added important source materials to its rich Biblioteca Scientifica. In spite of a very limited budget and meager economic resources, the institute has rendered invaluable services to Italian historians and scholars. Indeed, in recent years through its publications and congresses it has made significant and far-reaching contributions to our knowledge of the complicated and confused picture of the social, economic, cultural, and diplomatic history of the peninsula. Besides, it has given great impulse and encouragement to scholars in this field of Italian history.

In her third and last volume containing the correspondence of Nino Bixio, the Italian patriot of the Risorgimento, Emilia Morelli brings to full fruition a task which started a little more than a decade ago (in 1939) when the first volume, containing the letters from 1847 to 1860, made its appearance. The second volume, which includes the correspondence from 1861 to 1865, was issued in 1942, during the war. The present volume (letters DLXIX-CMLXX) covers the correspondence from January 1, 1866, to December 27, 1870. Besides numerous letters to his wife and friends the correspondence in this third volume is addressed to high-ranking military leaders, government officers, and other prominent Italians of the period: Atto Vannucci, A. Depretis, Silvio Spaventa, Enrico Morozzo della Rocca, G. Garibaldi, Raffaele Rubattino, Enrico Cialdini, Cesare Cantù, Giuseppe Govoni, Giuseppe Guerzoni, and Raffaele Cadorna.

As may well be expected the letters deal with those events with which Bixio identified himself during this period of his life, e.g., the role he played as commander of the seventh division during the third war of Italian independence with special reference to the battle of June 24, 1866, in which he distinguished himself for his calm bravery and skill; his firm opposition to the 1866 armistice which he called the greatest misfortune that could befall Italy; the courageous and energetic manner in which he covered that retreat; his election to the Chamber of Deputies and his efforts to strengthen the military position of Italy; his studies on the navy yard of Venice; his researches on the iron industry and its relation to the military and naval armaments; his support of the movement favoring Italy's colonial expansion in Asia; his nomination as senator; his travels up and down the peninsula from March to June, 1870, collecting information on Italian commerce and industry; his re-enlistment in the army and his command of the military division of Bologna at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War; his military assignment in the Papal States; his role in the capitulation of Civitavecchia without firing a shot and his withdrawal to private life after the occupation of Rome. Although these letters do not reveal anything that is important and startling new, yet they supply many interesting details and sidelights on some of the chief char-

acters of those exciting years of Italian history. Besides a good introduction, the editor has supplied adequate notes and an index of names.

In his *Rapporti delle Cose di Roma (1848-1849)* Professor Ghisalberti in his usual scholarly manner has brought together the unpublished official correspondence of Count Augusto de Liedekerke de Beaufort, the Dutch envoy and minister plenipotentiary of His Majesty to the Holy See during a very critical period of papal history. De Liedekerke transmitted these despatches to the four successive ministers of foreign affairs—Count de Randwijck, Count G. Schimmelpenninck, Baron A. de Bentinck, and L. A. Lightenvelt. Although these despatches do not reveal anything sensational or spectacular and, therefore, will not oblige the student of the Risorgimento to revise drastically his knowledge of the men and events of that period, yet they will help him to form a better judgment and come to a better understanding of the attitude of an honest, intelligent, and well-informed foreign observer of the papal scene.

In his analysis of Italian events de Liedekerke, who was a moderate liberal, or better, an enlightened conservative, presents a different if not a novel point of view. Since he was an objective observer and was, in the words of Ghisalberti, "au dessus de la mêlée," de Liedekerke is not only never indifferent but, as a matter of fact, is deeply concerned with the problems that weighed heavily upon the principal actors, and since his judgment is always well-informed and intelligent, he nearly always can foresee their solution. Thus the reader has an opportunity to see, through the eyes of a keen observer, the Italian scene from the revolution of Palermo of January 12, 1848, to the fall of Rome on July 3, 1849.

De Liedekerke wrote and commented on all important and many minor events of the period: the enthusiasm of the populace for the benediction of Italy, the joy of the Romans over the granting of the constitution, the popular enthusiasm for the war, the dramatic disillusionment due to the allocution of April 29, the summer riots, the failure of the constitutional government, the murder of Rossi, the flight of the Pope, the republican leaders, the reactionary extremist measures of the curia from its exile in Gaeta, and Garibaldi's defence of Rome. Even when he is writing about the populace, with whom he disagrees, de Liedekerke is calm and serene in his judgment, as when he praises Garibaldi the day after the fall of the republic.

Professor Ghisalberti has supplied an excellent introduction, footnotes, and an index of names mentioned in the despatches. Both volumes should be in the possession of all serious students of the Italian Risorgimento.

HOWARD R. MARRARO

Columbia University

The Siberian Intervention. By John Albert White. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 471. $6.00.)

After the rise of the Soviet regime and its conclusion of the separate peace with the Central Powers in 1918, the allies decided to intervene in the developing Russian civil war. American troops were sent to northern Russia and on August 16, 1918, an American force under General Graves landed in Vladivostok. The bulk of the intervention in Siberia was carried out by Japan which hoped to gain new territories as a result of the chaos prevailing after 1917 in the Russian Far East. For a time it seemed that the anti-Soviet regime set up in Siberia under the Supreme Leader Admiral Kolchak would be victorious; it had come into existence after a revolt of Czech legions had struck a shattering blow to Soviet rule in Asiatic Russia from the Volga to the Pacific. But the Kolchak regime collapsed in 1920. The same year brought the end of the intervention policy of the United States and the allies. The development of world affairs forced reluctant Japan in 1922 to abandon all Russian territories occupied by her on the Asiatic continent. The Russian half of Sakhalin Island was given back to the Soviet Union only in 1925.

Mr. White's book describes these events with meticulous care. He has exploited fully the rich material on his subject available in the Hoover Library at Stanford University. His book is an important contribution for the study of the Soviet regime as well as of far eastern affairs. The geographical, historical, and economic background is carefully analyzed. There is, for instance, a very valuable chapter on the railways in the Russian Far East. The view that American intervention in Siberia had as the main aim prevention of Japanese expansion is convincingly proved (e.g., p. 261 ff.). Impressive also is the analysis of the causes of the defeat of the White armies. Despite his stated will to be impartial, the author betrays that Kolchak and his reactionary under-leaders do not enjoy his sympathy. He is, of course, right in describing the fateful negative role which the cruelty of such anti-Bolsheviks as Semenov and Kalmukov played and in stating that the Japanese policy aiming at a weak Russia was in contradiction to the allied support of Kolchak, whose victory would have restored the Russian Empire. White absolves the Czechs and the French General Janin of guilt for the abandonment of Kolchak to his enemies who later executed him.

The motives of the various intervening powers are clearly shown; the role of the hope to establish again an eastern front against Germany is correctly emphasized, though the fear of the revolutionary Bolshevik propaganda is not enough emphasized. Despite some unnecessary repetitions, the book must be regarded as a model of a study on recent events. The hope may be expressed that the author will fulfill the promise made in

his preface and present soon other volumes on the Soviet Union in the Far East.

WALDEMAR GURIAN

University of Notre Dame

Lenin, a Biography. By David Shub. (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc. 1948. Pp. viii, 438. $5.00.)

This book has been widely reviewed and well received. Re-reading it confirms our first judgment that it proved honestly that the life of Lenin is the lethal energy of Communism. So many who thought of Communism as an economy or a philosophy gave it a liberal adjustment, only to find that Communism, like the religion of Mohammed, takes mankind to be an instrument of wrath for the present time and a formless mass out of which the classless society of the future is to be made. The philosophy of Hegel, the economics and sociology of Marx and Engels, are dead bones; they never could encompass a crusade, but the angry blood and proud flesh of Lenin gave these bones a horrid life that now wolfs the world.

David Shub, the author of this biography of Lenin, accents this truth dramatically and sets the climate of the book in the conclusion of the prologue. Lenin's brother, Alexander, was an idealist, a courageous and most sensitive youth. He believed that the liberation of Russia required the czar's assassination and plotted the accomplishment. Alexander was arrested and hung. Lenin idolized his brother fanatically and reacted so violently to his execution that he became a compulsive revolutionist. According to Shub:

> When the St. Petersburg newspaper carrying the news of Alexander's execution reached Vladimir in Simbirsk he threw the paper to the floor and cried:
> "I'll make them pay for this! I swear it!"
> "You'll make who pay?" asked a neighbor, Maria Savenko.
> "Never mind, I know," Vladimir replied.
> The world knows Vladimir Ulianov as Lenin.

Now this author is too well informed to make revenge the single dynamic of Lenin's life but the twenty-two chapters of his book reveal that this incident drained all mercy from him.

Shub's work is the most authentic portrait of Lenin in English; but it is certainly not the last word on him. Mr. Shub knew Lenin and most of those associated with the revolution but not well enough, nor are the documents available to answer the perplexing questions that constantly interrupt our reading. It may be a long time before the mystery of Lenin within the enigma of Communism will be known. This paradox of a man:

the slit-eyed hunter, lover of animals and children, sensitive to music and every form of beauty, so disciplined that he made over his sick body twice; so gentle, yet so ruthless and relentless in pursuit, so merciless in his judgments, so implacable in his demands; where his shadow falls across the earth, freedom dies. We close the second reading of this good book thinking what a disciple this devil's own genius of a man might have been.

JOHN P. MONAGHAN

St. Margaret Mary Church
Staten Island

From a Political Diary. Russia, the Ukraine, and America, 1905-1945. By Arnold D. Margolin. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. viii, 250. $3.00.)

Mr. Margolin, a well known lawyer from Kiev, played a considerable role in the Ukrainian political movements of 1918-1922. During the Russian revolution of 1917 his name was familiar among the leaders of the more moderate Socialist groups in Russia. He left Petrograd after the Bolshevik *coup d'état* and returned early in 1918 to Kiev. There he became closely associated with the building up of Ukrainian independence and joined the Ukrainian Socialist Federalist Party. Appointed one of the justices of the newly-created Ukrainian Supreme Court of Appeals, he soon directed his activities to the purely political and diplomatic field. Toward the end of 1918 he was appointed Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs and member of the Ukrainian delegation to the Paris peace conference. His reminiscences of the years 1918-1922 are particularly interesting. We see him making frequent trips to Paris, London, and other European centers and coming in contact with the leading political personalities of the period following World War I. His foreign contacts were facilitated by his Socialist associations as well as by his activities in the international Jewish movements. He remained very much in the center of the Ukrainian diplomatic activities, especially in the years 1919-1920, when he was head of the Ukrainian mission to London. But the Ukrainian-Polish *rapprochement* and the subsequent Polish-Ukrainian military cooperation against Soviet Russia, greatly disapproved by the leftist elements of western Europe as well as radical Ukrainian politicians, brought the political and diplomatic career of Mr. Margolin to an end. He resigned in 1920.

In 1922 Margolin arrived in the United States as a representative of the Hamburg-America Steamship Company trying to establish shipping lines between the West and Soviet Russia. Afterwards he settled here, returning to legal and business activities. Nevertheless, he always re-

mained interested in east European problems and attempted to remain in a close contact with the development of American policy toward Soviet Russia.

This diary represents, to be sure, a point of view definitely colored by its author's political sympathies—one which is not very convincing today. The author, moreover, passes judgment on complex historical problems of eastern Europe, especially in connection with its religious history, with which he betrays an insufficient conversancy (cf. the statements on the eastern rites of the Catholic Church, pp. 237-238, etc.). Nevertheless, the book with the numerous memoranda and letters given in the appendix (pp. 177-242) are a valuable collection of materials for a student of eastern Europe after World War I.

OLGERD SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR

Georgetown University

Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945: From the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry. Series D (1937-1945), Volume III. *Germany and the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1950. Pp. xcvi, 951. $3.25.)

It should occasion no surprise if Clio's devotees look upon the Harz Mountains of Germany as something of an El Dorado. For here the American First Army in April, 1945, discovered 300 tons of German Foreign Ministry papers; these have been augmented by many more tons of Reich Chancellery documents and other smaller collections. Historians, who have been watching publications from these sources with critically appreciative eyes, are grateful that the project has been initiated with the fourth series (D) since this treats of the immediate origins of World War II. This third volume traces events from the German viewpoint from the beginning of the Spanish Civil War in July, 1936, to Franco's victory three years later.

Among the major western powers the "Latin sisters," France and Italy, took the extremes of opposite views. The Blum government originally supported the loyalists vigorously, but as time went on fear of a general war forced a modification of this position. On the other hand, Italy tended to run well ahead of her Axis partner and eventually committed 70,000 "volunteers" and fourteen billion lire to Franco's cause. England was caught in a cruel dilemma. Disliking a red Spain, yet fearing a nationalist victory would jeopardize her Mediterranean position, she sought to localize the conflict. Germany clearly desired a Franco victory from both ideological and economic reasons; yet it is clear that Germany did

nothing to foment rebellion in Spain. When it came she welcomed it as a blessed event to be aided with men, money, and material.

The volume ends with a revealing editorial note. Undoubtedly the intent was to drive home with Hitler's own words the lesson that "without the help of both countries (Italy and Germany) there would be no Franco today" (p. 933). Yet one cannot fail to notice the undercurrent of disappointment in Axis estimates of Franco; apparently Hitler and Mussolini felt they had given much and gotten little from the Spanish investment. Indeed, throughout the long and difficult period Franco preserved an astonishingly large area of independence. He remained highly critical of Italy, stalled Germany's request for mining concessions, delayed joining the Anti-Comintern Pact, and forcefully proclaimed neutrality in the event of a general war. He even leaned toward an Anglo-German *rapprochement.*

An excellent analytical list of documents and remarkably good appendices enhance the value of this volume which should, incidentally, dispel any overly simple, dichromatic view of the Spanish question. And with the Catholic Church today vilified as pro-Fascist, Catholic historians would do well to examine this whole series with a view toward appraising the true role of the Vatican. If the relatively few documents relevant to ecclesiastical diplomacy are any criterion the examination should prove fruitful and rewarding.

CLARENCE C. WALTON

University of Scranton

The World in Crisis. By J. Salwyn Schapiro. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1950. Pp. ix, 429. $4.00.)

This latest in the McGraw-Hill Series in History under the consulting editorship of Ralph E. Turner is an analysis of political, social, and economic movements with emphasis upon Germany, Russia, and America. It also aims to analyze the basic changes in modern capitalism and to reevaluate the results of colonial imperialism and nationalism in their impact upon the Far East. Professor Schapiro's approach is that of the secularist liberal. His view of Church-State relationships is expressed in the sentence, "The twentieth century was to solve the religious problem in many lands by the only method that had proved successful, the American method of separation of Church and State" (p. 8). He regards secularization as progress, citing France as a pioneer in this respect. In his views on capitalism, Dr. Schapiro is in favor of a modified form of capitalism which is apparently a "managed planned economy." In the light

of this, his constant reference to the aims of the New Deal as "radical" is somewhat puzzling.

Mr. Schapiro's attempt to separate racialism from nationalism leads to some rather sweeping generalizations regarding fascism. He declares "As Marxism was the soul of communism, racialism was the soul of Fascism" (p. 238). It is certainly difficult to prove this in the case of Mussolini's Italy. Again he states "The Fascists, however, insisted that the collective unit of mankind was not the political and changeable nation but the biological and permanent 'race'." This hardly applies to Italy and it might even be questioned as wholly applicable to National Socialist Germany. The common basis all fascist and communist regimes have in nationalism is neglected. If Franco is fascist, as Professor Schapiro insists, it is difficult to find racialism as the crux of his ideology.

While there is extended treatment of the development of the socialist parties in Europe, slight attention is paid to the growth of the Christian Socialist and Christian Democratic parties in Italy, France, Germany, and Belgium. From the viewpoint of the secularist liberal, this is not a strange omission but any volume discussing political and social movements of the twentieth century would certainly have to devote some space to the aims of the confessional parties and trade unions.

The view that "Germany vanished from the scene of her greatness unwept, unhonored and unsung" (p. 283), illustrates the idea that Germany could become a vacuum and must be somewhat revised as High Commissioner McCloy urges the Germans to remilitarize. It may be too soon to state as does Dr. Schapiro that "as a dramatic protest against the suppression of democracy, Masaryk committed suicide" (p. 303). The question "Did he fall or was he pushed?" which creeps into so many "suicides" in fascist and communist countries may have to remain unanswered for a while. In summation *The World in Crisis* is adequate in reflecting the view of a twentieth-century liberal. It should be balanced, however, with a consideration of the moral and spiritual values necessary if a new world is to be created.

JAMES M. EAGAN

Lewis College
Lockport

AMERICAN HISTORY

The Price of Union. By Herbert Agar. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1950. Pp. xviii, 750. $5.00.)

Here is another example of a capable writer—but unseasoned historian—attempting to get beyond his depth. Dr. Agar has written a volume

filled with spectacular detail but empty of research. A check of the author's notes chapter by chapter discovers many glaring omissions and many poor selections. This is a book for the man in the street, not for the professional historian.

Dr. Agar's preface states his thesis: "To show the growth of our political system through the men who developed it from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt." In two concluding chapters he attempts to sum up the happenings of the last forty years. These are the best written of the volume, but from time to time they suffer from showing the hand of Mr. Agar's advisers, Robert Sherwood and Allan Nevins.

The author attempts to show that while the framers of the Constitution never intended to set up political parties, the type of government chosen could not operate without them. His main theme, therefore, is that political parties have been more instrumental in determining our form of government than the Constitution itself. In his view growth of party strength was most consistent with the economic and numerical growth of the country. Political parties were the balance wheels that made compromise possible. The history of our third parties is found in new ideas and the attempt to force the major parties to accept them. These points made are not new. Many—C. Perry Patterson for one in *Presidential Government in the United States*—have better recorded them.

Mr. Agar's weakness, in chapter after chapter, comes from an attempt to tell too much. Choosing one at random, Chapter XXV (pp. 509-526) discusses a very important constitutional problem, the disputed election of 1876. Vital though the subject is the author fails to use even the standard works on his subject. It is generally accepted that the method used to elect a President in 1876 was anything but constitutional, yet Agar ignores proper weighting of pro and con positions in the development of his thesis. Such deficiency indicates the failure of a professional writer to turn historian.

However, with all its weakness the book tells an intriguing story. It develops and explains plausibly the reason why in the United States the balance of power no longer exists in the true sense of the term. Quotes from the works of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Allan Nevins, and Morison and Commager are frequent. If you have read any or all of these men there is no further need to read Agar for either matter or method. When the author is discussing American personalities or looking into America's future, he is at his best. Conversely, when the past demands scientific investigation and selection for any original contribution Mr. Agar is sadly lacking. In short, this book is journalism not history.

JAMES J. FLYNN

Fordham University

American Democracy and Natural Law. By Cornelia Geer Le Boutillier. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. vi, 204. $3.00.)

It is difficult to review a book which is utterly wanting in an understanding of the subject with which it purports to deal. If Miss Le Boutillier had paid more or less (it is hard to say which) attention to the semantics that she continually holds, like a magic wand, before her powerless readers she might not yet have written her book and all her confusions would still be purely semantic.

Miss Le Boutillier describes two interpretations of natural law which have come down through history. One of these she takes to be the "traditional" one, and she ascribes it to Plato (not to Aristotle), Cicero, St. Thomas Aquinas, the neo-Kantians, and Jacques Maritain; she calls this one a "metaphysical wonder," a "congery of assumed absolutes." The other interpretation of natural law takes the "natural law" to be a "human construct," won through a long struggle for freedom, "pragmatically designed in the interest of utility." The first interpretation, she says, is like a fog; and it certainly is. The second, she says, is like a fresh breeze, nay more, "a rushing and mighty wind." And it is; it is like a great deal of wind. Through this wind and fog we see David Hume and Oliver Wendell Holmes bringing "to sharpest focus" the natural law doctrine of Aristotle. To see this, one's vision *must* be blurred by fog and wind. We see also the founding fathers and a long line of Supreme Court justices wrestling with natural law, now the foggy one, now the windy one. What Miss Le Boutillier wants us finally to see is that natural law is simply a lot of human effort, blood, sweat, and tears, for the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

Miss Le Boutillier is entangled in words, concepts, names, and phobias when all that is needed is a mind for the truth. What she should do is read what St. Thomas Aquinas says concerning the changeableness of natural law. She will get all the change she can handle, if that's what she wants, and she certainly does; next she should read the first and fifth books especially, of Aristotle's *Ethics,* and in order to understand these books let her work carefully with the commentary of Aquinas. Miss Le Boutillier will learn so much and so many surprising things in so short a time that she will be deeply shocked, I am sure, at the temerity of her little book.

CHARLES N. R. MCCOY

St. Louis University

Appeals to the Privy Council from the American Plantations. By Joseph Henry Smith. With an Introductory Essay by Julius Goebel, Jr. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. lxi, 770. $10.00.)

This elaborate and important study of the appeals function of the Privy Council—as it affected our colonial history and our constitutional tradition—gives an impression of almost heroic application by the author. There are no convenient reports of cases, and the result of Mr. Smith's efforts to make a complete study of the scattered materials, largely manuscript sources, has been to overcome the main obstacle which has heretofore proved to be insurmountable for the less patient, or for those uninstructed in the complexities of the problem. To follow an appeal from its inception within some colonial jurisdiction through the appeal process to Whitehall, to locate the colonial and administrative remains of the process, and then to recover the arguments, memoranda, and subsequent reflections of parties, counsel, colonial agents, and members of the council board, all this requires the search of practically every corridor of eighteenth-century Anglo-American antiquities. If some of these corridors have been explored by others, in connection with some case of interest in the history of one colony, or by way of a partial study of the whole subject herein treated, then Mr. Smith's difficulties were often only increased as he went over the same territory for review, correction of misapprehensions, and placing of the item among all of the appeals from the American plantations. The reader should, therefore, express no surprise to find this a difficult book, weighty in detail, requiring not only that the legal terminology be well understood but that sufficient interest carry him through lengthy footnotes and cross references.

The Privy Council afforded an appeals tribunal for each of the several dominions, each of which had its own hierarchy of courts locally controlled. Appeals to the sovereign were as much the right of the subject as they were consonant with the prerogative, and the latter was no mere vestige for colonial Americans. Had the mediaeval precedents—about which Mr. Goebel writes a characteristically erudite foreword—made fewer concessions to the heterogeneity of the private law, one imperial court might have served the whole of America with original writs made to run in Virginia, New York, Jamaica, *et al.* As it was, and after the Long Parliament had burked the judicial power of the Privy Council in the realm, only the privileges and immunities of the Channel Islanders, long accustomed to seek relief from His Majesty in council, remained to furnish precedents for analogous practice in our colonial period. Despite the opposition, notably in Massachusetts, to the idea of ordinary appeals from colonial courts, these became a regular feature of an unwritten constitution by the end of the seventeenth century. In a very handy appendix Mr. Smith has tabulated the statistics for the period, 1696-1783, for the whole

empire, of appeals in common law (civil and criminal), in chancery, in vice-admiralty, and in probate and administration. From these are to be abstracted 795 appeals from the American plantations, not counting "three appeals . . . from determinations of royal boundary commissioners, two from legislative commitments, and one from a determination of a Dutch court at Demerara." Not the least interesting aspect of all this is the wide extent of the American acquiescence in the appeals process, modified only by a disposition in some few cases to resent, even to frustrate, decisions which affected vital local interests. Reasons for this general attitude are to be understood only if one realizes that the Privy Council furnished a court for Americans in which there were, as Mr. Smith points out, as many winners as losers. Then, too, the council board took an attitude toward law-making and law-declaring on the part of inferior American bodies which, if not always approving, was at least mildly deferential. Political opposition to administrative and legislative supervision is given clarity by contrast in this thorough treatment of judicial matters, and one can better understand from this book why Americans regarded the common law as a valued heritage long after they had lost faith in the king in Parliament.

There are some occasions in the book for digressions about the constitution of the empire, but Mr. Smith is more concerned to give express utterance to the scope and variety manifest in the application of law. The attention to detail would be more commendable if the author was not at the same time inclined to quarrel with his material; and herein he demonstrates that he is a lawyer first and above all. It distresses him to find that the council board was slow to make definitions where definitions should have been made, that certain matters (e.g., admiralty appeals) were never straightened out as to process, and that despite assertions of adherence to the principle of *stare decisis* nevertheless important decisions were only remembered and generally brought to bear by a shifting personnel in committee. It bothers him as well that the low standards of judicial performance in some American jurisdictions were not only tolerated on review in England, but were even accepted as normal preliminaries which could not be challenged as to form or substance on appeal. This last served to offer insult to a jurisdiction like New York where high standards were enforced below by the local supreme court. Finally, it shocks Mr. Smith that laymen not learned in the law, with inadequate assistance from the lawyers and judges of the realm, had so much to do with the making of committee decisions which then appeared as orders in council. These are hard lines for Mr. Smith, who is appreciative of great learning in the law, and who would have none but trained lawyers and judges make legal history, or even write about it.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

Jonathan Edwards. By Perry Miller. [American Men of Letters Series.] (New York: William Sloane Associates. 1949. Pp. xv, 348. $3.50.)

When Professor Miller published *The New England Mind* in 1939 he raised the level of study of American intellectual history to a new plane of seriousness. In that work, which followed his *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts,* Miller analyzed in detail and with depth the basic ideas which made up the anatomy of the Puritan mind in the seventeenth century. This present account of Jonathan Edwards is the intellectual history of that eighteenth-century Puritan thinker whose theology and philosophy were radically opposed to the attempts which his seventeenth-century predecessors had made to corrupt the teachings of Calvin. The point of departure for all of Edwards' thought was his celebration of the doctrine of man's utter dependency on God.

In tracing the development of Edwards' thought special attention is paid to its genesis. With great care Miller demonstrates Edwards' debt to Locke for his psychological orientation and to Newton for his attitude toward science. Miller believes that the high point of Edwards' growth was reached in *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (1746) in which he defended the emotional appeal which nourished the Great Awakening. It is, writes Professor Miller, "the most profound exploration of the religious psychology in all American literature" (p. 177). The author's admiration may be explained in part by the fact that he delights in Edwards' identification of the regenerate man as one of extraordinarily sensitive perceptions, a distinction in which the "saint" and the artist become almost synonymous. Historians, who may be less certain of their artistic election, are not neglected, for Miller concludes his study with an exhilarating interpretation of Edwards' uncompleted *History of the Work of Redemption,* arguing that when Edwards attempted to write a philosophy of history, he faced the crucial spiritual problem which must also concern our generation.

Without doubt, Miller's book will become the center of future discussions about Jonathan Edwards. Warning must be given, however, of the exaggeration and inflation which his enthusiasm provoke and which often lead him to credit Edwards with accomplishments beyond his original attainments. Objection must also be entered against the embarrassing foreword where, to appease his readers, Miller assures them that "Edwards was infinitely more than a theologian. He was one of America's five or six major artists" (p. xii). To impose this hierarchy is to force the author's arbitrary standards on his hero, an unfair coercion.

The evolution of the historiography of American thought in the last two decades can be summed up in the contrast between the approach of Parrington and that of Miller to the analysis of Jonathan Edwards. For

Parrington, Edwards was an "anachronism" in his own time and in all subsequent American experience. For Miller, Edwards was ahead of his time and represents the summation of American thought. The reaction to Parrington's habit of judging a man solely according to his social and economic beliefs led to the recent co-operative work, *Literary History of the United States,* grounded in the method of analysis used by Professor Miller, in which the special problems of the artist become the main criterion for interpreting a man's thought. The over-simplification of Parrington's method, by his less capable followers, resulted in an unendurable monologue on a single theme. With those who imitate Miller the danger will be that the acceptance and cultivation of that obscurity which seems essential to the practice of art may render the future histories of American thought increasingly unintelligible.

EDWARD GARGAN

Boston College

American History as Interpreted by German Historians from 1770 to 1815. By Eugene Edgar Doll. [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Volume 38, Part 5.] (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. 1949. Pp. 421-534. $1.75.)

This study is an investigation of cultural interpretations and relationships. American history as first written by German historians is here traced from the earliest presentations of America through the founding of Pennsylvania and German emigration, the impact of the American Revolution on such historians as Friedrich Wilhelm von Taube, Christian Leiste, and Matthias Christian Sprengel, to Christoph Daniel Ebeling and his contemporaries, Eberhard von Zimmermann and Dietrich von Buelow. Mr. Doll stresses the influence of emigration, the liberal sympathy for American independence, the German mercenary troops, and the implications of the new republic in European balance of power, as dominant motivations for these German historians.

A number of centers of *Amerikakunde* developed early in Germany, especially at Goettingen, Hamburg, Berlin, Frankfurt-am-Main, and Bremen; later Stuttgart and Tuebingen became strong and vigorous publishing centers and university headquarters for American studies. The great majority of these writers applied the aims and methods of the popular scientific discipline of *Statistik* to their writings on the United States with the corresponding result of solid, sober, and factual scholarship. Data were gathered with great care, the critical and comparative use of sources was developed to a greater extent than in England, France, or the United States itself, and non-essential detail or partisan interpretation gave way

to orderly, if monotonous, sequence. The early German historians were as impartial as their nineteenth-century liberalism would allow them to be; but this is not notably in their favor. The materialistic influences of the Englightenment as well as the importance of commercial interests definitely colored their outlook on the United States. The only religious influences they could see at work in the new world were those of brotherhood and justice among men. However, they did not fail to point up the early fanaticism, immaturity, and mercenary egoism of the American scene.

Mr. Doll states that these foundations of descriptive and critical scholarship in Germany were subsequently utilized rather more in the United States than by the Germans themselves. The author has written a thorough, if over-sympathetic, essay which reveals careful study of sources. Unfortunately, he could not resist the temptation, at the end, of idealizing these early nineteenth-century "enlightened" German historians as a pattern for present and future German-American scholastic relations.

COLMAN J. BARRY

St. John's University
Collegeville

Lafayette between the American and the French Revolution (1783-1789). By Louis Gottschalk. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 461. $7.50.)

This fourth volume in Louis Gottschalk's meticulous biography of Lafayette maintains the superb scholarship of its predecessors. The true character of Lafayette, the explanation of many seeming contradictions in his conduct, and the gradual development of his ideas continue to emerge from the pages of this book as they have from the earlier volumes. Lafayette enjoyed great good fortune during life in attracting to himself the finest of friends. His historic reputation is equally fortunate in attracting a biographer of outstanding ability.

The period covered is but six years, the time between the two great revolutions in which Lafayette played important roles. It was a time-span which might seem at first glance to be relatively unimportant in the young nobleman's glittering career. It is precisely this conclusion which must be abandoned after reading this book. These were the years when Lafayette matured his political ideals and entered into a more responsible and settled adulthood. These were the years when he prepared himself intellectually for the trying times ahead. Many of his activities were directed toward commercial projects of one kind or another, particularly those concerned with tying closer the bonds between France and America. Yet his growing interest in politics, his increasing maturity, and his great prestige

on both sides of the Atlantic gave to all his activities a definite political cast. His third voyage to America in 1784 exercised great influence on the political ideas of Americans and Freshmen alike. Lafayette proved to be one of the ablest of "goodwill ambassadors."

As Washington had become, during the years of the American Revolution, the revered mentor of Lafayette, so Jefferson, after Lafayette's return to France, came to be another great influence in his life. The relationship between Jefferson and the Frenchman was quite unlike the attachment of Lafayette to Washington, whom Lafayette called his "adoptive father." Jefferson and Lafayette, each interested in furthering the cause of commercial understanding between France and the United States, found themselves working together for the achievement of common ends on numerous occasions. Out of their association arose a firm friendship. Out of it also came for Lafayette a great measure of political education, provided by one of the ablest exponents of republicanism. Lafayette's "future political education thus lay in Jefferson's hands to a degree that might have astonished both men had they realized it."

The book ends on the eve of the great upheaval in France. It leaves Lafayette a convinced revolutionary. This was much more than he had been six years earlier at the end of the American war. Then he had mouthed the jargon of republicanism without understanding its true meaning or significance. Now he was one "for whom the Rights of Man were no longer slogans but a heartfelt credo."

JOHN J. MENG

Hunter College of the City of New York

Bring Out Your Dead. The Great Plague of Yellow Fever in Philadelphia in 1793. By J. H. Powell. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1949. Pp. xi, 304. $3.75.)

The yellow fever plagues of Philadelphia are no longer required studies for the students of medicine but, as Dr. Powell notes, the human values which find expression in times of crisis are always worth the retelling. In an exceptionally well written study of the city's greatest plague, the author has placed in clear historical perspective the contributions of Philadelphia's leading citizens. Dr. Benjamin Rush emerges as the great hero of the plague, not by reason of his sound medicine, but because of his courageous refusal to lose hope in the face of terrible disaster. Wrong though he may have been, Rush gave hope to many, to many more than his drastic remedies speeded on their way to death.

Of especial interest are the author's preface and concluding essay. In them he reveals an approach to history which is intriguing and stimulat-

ing. An historian's facts, he says, are accessible to anyone, "his use of them is his own particular contribution to understanding, and to morality." It may be that Dr. Powell in his theorizing gives too much emphasis to the circumstances of time and place, that he makes these shape too fundamentally the men on whom they act. Yet in his narrative men like Benjamin Rush and Stephen Girard are shapers of the times and their hopeful zeal may well have saved the city from complete panic. Individuals, indeed, are shaped by the times in which they live. But in all times that try men's souls, God raises up some individuals who have the power of shaping circumstance. And, to this reviewer, the truer approach to history is that which gives due emphasis to the triumph of man's free will over his environment.

Unencumbered by the footnotes typical of most historical treatises, this book reads easily and well. In style, perhaps, a bit too sustained, the quick flow of the narrative reveals an author who has given equal attention to the demands of historical accuracy and to the writing problem which defeats so many historians.

The essay on the sources is a capable substitute for the more usual burdensome footnotes and the index is both accurate and complete. In format the book is attractive, somewhat marred by the unfortunately garish choice of color for the spine lettering. A delightfully fresh telling of an episode of American history, the book has special value as a stimulant for thinking on the major problems of historical writing.

BARTHOLOMEW F. FAIR

Saint Charles Seminary
Philadelphia

Backwoods Utopias. The Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America: 1663-1829. By Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 288. $4.00.)

In accurate and painstaking scholarship this book on the early so-called communistic communities in the United States compares favorably with previous studies prepared and published under the auspices of the Commitee on the Albert G. Beveridge Memorial Fund of the American Historical Association. In the first sixty pages—roughly one-fourth of the volume—the author probes into the relationship between the life and thought of the many "sectarian" communities established in colonial and early national America and the later "secular" communities, the first phase of which—that of Robert Owen and his followers—is treated exhaustively. Professor Bestor contends—pretty conclusively in the reviewer's opinion—

that after 1812 the various sectarian establishments underwent secularization, laying less and less stress on their peculiar theological tenets and emphasizing increasingly social and economic values. By demonstrating that they could be economically successful, these religious utopias prepared the way for the purely secular Owenite and Fourierite experiments.

On Owen's career as a social reformer the book is full and virtually definitive. Although one may question the author's conclusion that New Harmony in Indiana failed so speedily and miserably mainly because of its founder's inattention to managerial details, none can find fault with the objectivity and thoroughness with which Professor Bestor handles the story. Attached to the study are an illuminating bibliographical essay and a check-list of communitarian experiments initiated in the United States before 1860, both products of discriminating scholarship. Not less important than its technical perfection is the social insight which the book displays. Although they were collectivist and outer individualistic, the backwoods utopias were not truly communistic or socialistic, as is commonly but erroneously believed. They called for drastic and radical changes in society, but they had no sympathy with either the violence of the revolutionaries or the gradualism of the social reformers. They expected social transformation to spread through the contagion of successful community experimentalizing, they stood for "communitarianism"—a term coined by the leaders in 1840 to characterize their movement. This fact Professor Bestor discovered while preparing his doctoral dissertation at Yale on American Fourierism. It is rumored that he is about to publish his final and mature estimate of that interesting episode in our social history.

AARON I. ABELL

University of Notre Dame

John Wesley Jarvis, American Painter, 1780-1840, with a Checklist of His Works. By Harold E. Dickson. (New York: New York Historical Society. 1949. Pp. xx, 476. Plates, indices. $10.00.)

John Wesley Jarvis: "Who *was* the fellow?" To the factually biographical side of this question, Harold E. Dickson of Pennsylvania State College has given what must be by all odds the fullest possible answer. His work is certainly the definitive life of Jarvis, "an American portrait painter of the early nineteenth century, standing in point of time between Gilbert Stuart and Thomas Sully, but closer to the latter, who by his contemporaries was commonly placed with these two at the head of the profession." Dickson succeeds, perhaps beyond the limit of the general historian's curiosity, in placing Jarvis in the external world of his time. He sketches

the artist's surroundings, his movements from address to address and from city to city, his friends, and his roisterous and sometimes discreditable private life. His paintings are also listed and discussed.

Yet the reader puts down this book with a dissatisfied feeling. One reason may be that Jarvis emerges as little or nothing more than a prominent practitioner of "the sound business of building replicas of the human features." Does such a man really deserve the devoted attention the author has bestowed upon him? Perhaps he does; for he did leave a record of many distinguished as well as obscure men and women, the sight of whose faces through the painter's honest eyes adds something to one's comprehension of the period. On the other hand, although the historian may be interested in the creator of this gallery of portraits, however valueless they may be as great art, he will find that Dickson raises more questions than he fully answers. Why, e.g., were Jarvis' contemporaries as impressed as they were by his ability as an artist; what was the prevailing taste of the time; was his bohemianism largely put on as an advertisement of his profession? If so, why was his eccentricity considered good advertising? The author's findings and his quotations from the painter's associates suggest answers to queries of this sort, but the adherence in very large part to a strictly factual technique leaves a wide opening for interpretation which barely comes out in the final, brief chapter or critical analysis. To use a phrase which Dickson applies to Jarvis' paintings, this study is a forceful document; it is not a probing inquiry into the significance of an artist and his world.

RICHARD J. STORR

Howard University

The Yankee Exodus: An Account of Migration from New England. By Stewart H. Holbrook. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1950. Pp. xii, 398. $5.00.)

With the deftness which has long since established Stewart Holbrook as a highly readable author of Americana, *Yankee Exodus* unwinds the westward trails of nineteenth-century New Englanders on the move. Yankee promoters of all types, lawyers, money-lenders, school teachers, men of the cloth, inventors, gold seekers, grain farmers, plain vagabonds, and a score of their occupational kin came down and out of their austere, rocky hills and increasingly urban valleys to transplant carefully and sometimes unwittingly their Puritan culture across the northern states. Their motives were almost as numerous as their numbers—but all agreed that the prime measure of their success was the ability to gain, keep, and increase the fruits of this world in a respectable fashion. The urge to

better one's self could not be contained by those who left; consequently even their own much loved locale was deserted in the quest. Homesickness and remorse—or the vague golden glow of paradise left—was reflected in their nostalgic reveries about Vermont or Connecticut. This reminiscent mood pervades the book, having been carefully captured by Holbrook who autobiographically relates his own story as well as that of his neighbors.

Although those whose ancestors come from New England may welcome this work, the critical historian will detect many deficiencies. Holbrook has culled a good deal of material from local historical journals of varying quality. But sometimes there is little to indicate where legend ends and the "true story" begins. And there are all too few mentions of specific sources. The major drawback, however, is the apparent decision of the author to sacrifice depth for detail. Thus many pages present a plethora of mere names and seemingly endless lists of places which, it is proposed, were "civilized" (pp. vii, viii) by New Englanders. The more significant task of assessing the lasting Yankee impact on various localities has thus been left to historians who will combine a deep insight into the complex urban and rural milieu with sufficient knowledge of local history to reconstruct and weigh causal influences. Holbrook's survey may help to hasten this accomplishment.

JAMES J. GREEN

University of Notre Dame

The New Stars: Life and Labor in Old Missouri. By Manie Kendley Morgan. (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press. 1950. Pp. xviii, 301. $3.75.)

The author of this volume grew up near DeKalb, Missouri, and was in her teens when the Civil War broke out. Towards the end of her life, after reading Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind,* she determined to tell the story of life on a Missouri plantation, the experiences of her family and their Negro slaves, and the rebuilding of a new way of life. *New Stars* throws light on the day-by-day contacts between master and slave, the effects of the Emancipation Proclamation on the institution of slavery in the border states, and the passing of plantation life. The locale under consideration is important, for nowhere was the problem more acute and complex than in Missouri, still a comparatively young state, an outpost of civilization. Yet, Missouri was at the crossroads of immigrant travel to the Far West. It bordered "bleeding Kansas" in those days of the bushwhackers when the only force was that of the rifle and terrorization. The state, although settled for the most part by southerners, had become closer

economically to the North with the coming of the railroad. Slavery in the border states was less fundamental and more domestic than commercial. Slaves were held in smaller numbers mainly as family servants. Social habits were more those of the farm than of the plantation. Slaveholders were less regal as a class; therefore, they had less to lose with the passing of slavery than did their friends in the deep South.

The author is a student of human nature and her delineation of the impact of circumstances on the various characters is penetrating. The strong personalities of the narrative are her mother, Mary Jane Kendley, and Aunt Lucy, who approximated the characteristics of her mistress. The dramatic marriage of Manie to a Union officer lends romance to the account. Depredations of the Jayhawkers led to the organization of the Citizen's Forum. At one meeting the reading of a letter from a great uncle, Isaac Smith, written to his family from Valley Forge, engendered the patriotism necessary for the group to vow not to resort to violence without necessity.

That slavery was considered a way of life identified with culture and refinement was exemplified by the words of the author's sister, Julia, who had married an impoverished southerner: "Myself I have, himself Tom has. . . . This self if we will, whatever changes come, we may have to hold and to transmit to our blood." Her mother spoke in the same strain: "I will marry her (Manie) to wealth and fineness too. I value the latter as much as the former." Aunt Lucy feared that emancipation would deprive her grandchildren of culture: "Now they will talk like other Negroes not as Bill and I learned to talk in the big house just like white folks and as our children learned from us." Captain Morgan, the husband of the author, also believed that the South under slavery had produced a certain type of woman: ". . . Your manner of living protects the innocence of your girls. The worst fault they have is a bit of vanity. When they become women their devotion to their family shears that away. . . . Even slavery is almost justified in the womanhood it has created. Will this womanhood survive in the New Order?"

Although scholarly notes and an index are missing from this work, the reviewer feels that it is an excellent portrayal of the thinking and philosophy of not only the Kendley-Morgan-Smith clan in Missouri and Kentucky but of the relationship in most of the border states where the household consisted of the family proper and the Negro family of retainers. It was a shared economy with no manor and cabin establishments but rather a set-up where household duties were shared by all. The slave possessed dignity as an individual and occupied a position for which he had neither to apologize nor to rebel.

SISTER M. EVANGELINE THOMAS

Marymount College
Salina

The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865. By Ellis Merton Coulter. [A History of the South, edited by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and Ellis Merton Coulter. Volume VII.] (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1950. Pp. x, 644. $7.00.)

Volume VII of the series, A History of the South, originally assigned to Charles W. Ramsdell, has been capably done by Professor Coulter who also produced the previously published volume dealing with the South during reconstruction. Treating a subject that lends itself easily, especially to a southerner, to sentimental romanticism, the author has carefully avoided biased or one-sided history. He scrupulously presents the bald truth as he discovered it in his evidently vast research. He considers at length the enemies, spies, and traitors bred within the Confederacy; the dislike of President Davis by Governors Joseph E. Brown of Georgia and Zebulon B. Vance of North Carolina, by Robert Augustus Toombs, Henry S. Foote, and other important Confederate leaders; the procrastination of the southern Congress; the weakness of the president's cabinet; the financial insecurity of the government and the lack of financial ability among its leaders; the futility of taxes in the South; the slowness of the South to industrialize; the terrifying inefficiency of the southern railroads; the lack of enthusiasm for the army among many southern men; the opposition of the people to conscription; the treatment of prisoners of war and deserters; and the internal dissensions, especially the disagreements of individual states with the Confederate government. The book is not, of course, simply a catalog of Confederate faults but indicates its good points as well.

The author did not set out to write a history of the Civil War but rather a history of the South during the period of the war. Military policy and the campaigns have been confined to one of the twenty-two chapters. The fact of the war and its effects on various aspects of southern life at the time necessarily permeate the entire work, but the war is not allowed to dominate. This is not a military, diplomatic, political, or economic history; but all of these elements are included in a first-rate history of the activities and attitudes of the southern people during the Civil War period.

The Catholic reader, however, will find here little information on the history of the Church in the South. The magnificent work of the nun-nurses is dismissed in a single sentence; and in the section on education and religion the work of the Church is covered by a short paragraph. In another place, Confederate diplomatic relations with the Vatican are briefly treated, and Father John Bannon's work for the Confederacy in Ireland is mentioned.

The author's extensive use of manuscripts, government documents, correspondence, memoirs, autobiographies, diaries, journals, contemporary pamphlets, periodicals, and especially newspapers is evidenced by the lengthy critical essay on authorities and by the numerous footnotes. Live-

liness is added to the style by the utilization of frequent direct quotation from contemporaries and of acrostics and verses conveniently spaced throughout the book. The detailed index is another asset to a truly valuable work.

VINCENT DEPAUL MCMURRY

St. Charles College
Catonsville

Melville Weston Fuller. By Willard L. King. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1950. Pp. x, 394. $5.00.)

To the average reader of American history Melville Weston Fuller is not too impressive as a chief justice; one receives the impression that he was just a successful lawyer in Chicago who happened to be an adherent of the political party in power in the year 1888, and was rewarded for his party labors by President Cleveland appointing him to the highest judicial office in the country.

The author of this readable and interesting volume, however, portrays a very different picture. He sets the man who presided over our highest court for twenty-two years against his New England background and demonstrates how the traits of character developed in Fuller as a young man in his native Maine came to fruition in his work and achievements as Chief Justice of the United States.

> They (the people of New England) were shrewd, calculating and thrifty individualists, and yet had a profound sense of social responsibility. They held to the puritan ideal that to justify existence one must serve one's fellowmen in some way. They were passionate reformers. But they adhered to what was tried unless a proposed reform convinced their reason. They were against unthinking experiments and had no ear for those resting on an emotional appeal.

And in describing Fuller's development while still in college Mr. King remarks: "He concluded that it was far better to have a firm and indomitable will than to have brilliant talents. . . . He did not lack talents, but his character surpassed his intellect in significance."

The author, while not neglecting Fuller's professional attainments while at the Chicago bar and his contribution to American constitutional history in his judicial opinions, never departs from his thesis that here was a man of character, whether as a delegate to political conventions, an advocate representing private clients, presiding over our highest court, advisor to Presidents, or as a friend, steadfastly adhering to his moral and spiritual convictions and remaining true to his own fundamental character.

Justice Holmes, one of his confrères on the court, rather faintly praised him when he wrote: "As a presiding officer, Fuller was the greatest Chief

Justice I have ever known." The author, while clearly demonstrating that he was an efficient presiding justice who commanded the respect of his associates, and that he had much to do with expediting the business of the court, describes very clearly the part played by Fuller in the many important cases decided by the court during his tenure as its chief.

A mere mention of some of the cases passed on during his administration indicates how much constitutional law was developed at that time: In re Neagle: Mormon Church v. United States; Leisy v. Hardin; Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust Company (income tax); the Insular Cases; all involving questions of vital moment at the time and serving as precedents for many years to come. In these and many other cases of serious import, Fuller's opinions exhibited great moral force, courage in opposing popular desires in favor of what he thought was a more fundamental need, scholarly research, and a sane and moderate construction of the Constitution. "On the Court he regarded posterity as his client. He usually studied the precedents to distinguish them rather than to apply them; to unshackle the future from the past."

In the light of suggestions made from time to time in recent years it is interesting to note the chief justice's reply to Grover Cleveland when he was invited by the President to accept appointment as Secretary of State: ". . . I am convinced that the effect of the resignation of the Chief Justice under such circumstances would be distinctly injurious to the Court. The surrender of the highest judicial office in the world for a political position, even though so eminent, would tend to detract from the dignity and weight of the tribunal. We cannot afford this."

The author has apparently worked through a very wide assortment of newspapers, contemporary letters, speeches, judicial decisions, and other court records, as well as the early history of Fuller's forebears in Maine and elsewhere. He has contributed a worthwhile study of the man, the lawyer, the jurist, as well as an interesting survey of the Supreme Court and its work during a very interesting period of history.

LEO A. ROVER

Washington, D. C.

Agnes Repplier. Lady of Letters. By George Stewart Stokes. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1949. Pp. xiii, 274. $3.00.)

When Mr. Stokes was casting about for a title for his biography of Agnes Repplier, he could have selected none better than *Lady of Letters.* Miss Repplier was that. From the day she first looked into Hayward's translation of *Faust* when she was a nine-year-old girl until the final days of her middle nineties, Miss Repplier's whole world had been authors and

books, past and present, some foreign and some classic. When she sat down to tell us about them in her essays, she did so with a mind teeming with information to which she added her own inimitable style. The result was often brilliant and always companionable. Mary Ellen Chase was right in calling her the "dean of American essayists," and it is unfortunate that so distinguished a lady of letters should suffer so much neglect at the hands of our American anthologists.

Mr. Stokes' biography gives a certain amount of easy and pleasurable reading, probably because it must have been a pleasure to write. Over a period of five years he waited on Miss Repplier in her Clinton Street apartment. Her conversations over teacups had to be informative with a plentiful sprinkling of wit and humor. Indeed, the author seems to have absorbed some of the spirit and the Repplier manner himself in his first five chapters which deal with his subject's girlhood, convent life, and the "coming of age of a writer." These chapters read almost as easily as a piece of fiction. The remaining chapters capture well enough the charm, the culture, and even some of the "contrariness" that make old readers of Miss Repplier love her so much.

Those chapters in which the biographer gives the reader a sampling of Miss Repplier's numerous books of essays bog down. While it is true the many selections show her typical traits of grace, charm, delicate sentiment, fine spirituality (and sharp tongue, too), yet there is a sameness of pattern that makes for a certain tedium. For newer readers, however, these same chapters draw a complete picture of her work. All in all, the older reader of Miss Repplier will find the finer and deeper Miss Repplier missing from the book, yet Mr. Stokes' work does give the reader much the same feeling as a visit with old friends in one's native place.

EMMETT M. WALSH

Loyola University
Chicago

American Immigration Policy. A Reappraisal. Edited by William S. Bernard, Carolyn Zeleny, Henry Miller. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1950. Pp. xx, 341. $4.00.)

According to the publisher's note this book "presents a broad survey of our present immigration regulations, and against this examines the results of the quota system, the economic effects of immigration, the record of our immigrants in social adjustment, and the general effect of immigration on population trends." The study is published under the sponsorship of the National Committee on Immigration Policy, organized in 1945.

The introduction states that an attempt has been made to give the facts in such a way that the reader may form his own conclusions independently

of those expressed in the book; yet the same paragraph declares that "myths, rationalizations, prejudices, and false stereotypes have formed the environment which has produced our immigrant legislation." One gets the impression that favorable opinions are cited with approval whereas those contrary to the views of the editors are slighted or misinterpreted. As an example: the citation from Jerome, *Migration and Business Cycles* (1926) indicates that this economist found that "immigration, even . . . before legislative restriction, had played no important role in intensifying unemployment conditions," whereas his actual statement was that "immigration, in the year before the war, contributed materially to the growing volume of unemployment" and again that the "burden of . . . unemployment probably falls in part on the newly-arrived immigrants and in part on resident workers . . . replaced by immigrants willing to work for lower wages" (Jerome, *op. cit.*, pp. 120, 122). This citation (p. 85 of the book) seems a misinterpretation.

Moreover, while a congressional act of 1864 permitted the immigrants' wages to be pledged for the fulfillment of a contract bringing the man and the job together in the United States, this act was not officially known as the Contract Labor Law. Rather the law of February, 1885, favored by the Knights of Labor and which forbade the importation of laborers under contract, is customarily known as the Alien Contract Labor Law. Since the trade unions secured amendments strengthening the law of 1885 in 1887 and 1888, and in 1891 a prohibition of all forms of solicitation of immigrants, the statement that "The trade unions soon secured the repeal of the Contract Labor Law" (p. 10) evidently still refers to the act of 1864 which had been repealed four years later.

Although these and other errors—mostly minor—indicate some lack of a careful acquaintance with the history of immigration the book has much to recommend it. There is interesting information on the stimulating effect immigrants have had on our industry, culture, and employment. Defects in our policy are discussed and recommendations made that our general policy be brought into alignment with American traditions and with present international realities. Emphasis is placed on European migration, although that from Asia is adequately treated. The chapter, "Other Nations' Experience with Immigration," is very interesting; while the final chapter, "Conclusions and Recommendations," is thought-provoking and constructive. Of the numerous tables carefully worked out those in the chapters on indices of adjustment and on population trends present valuable facts of a sociological and economic nature. Besides these the book contains statistics, charts, appendices, a long bibliography, and an ample index.

SISTER MARY GILBERT KELLY

Rosary College

The United States in a Chaotic World and *The New Deal and World Affairs.* By Allan Nevins. [Chronicles of America, Volumes 55 and 56.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 252; ix, 332. $6.00 per volume.)

The decision to bring the splendid original series of fifty volumes of the Chronicles of America up to date was a happy one, happy alike in conception and in execution. These two volumes by Professor Nevins closely approach the high standards of the older in literary style and clarity of expression, and equal the standards of scholarship of the earlier authors. They serve well the distinctive and very laudable purpose of providing presentations by scholars in a manner attractive and understandable to all.

The second volume is longer than the first because of the greater amount of material that had to be treated. That may have prompted the editorial decision to make the break at 1933. One suspects that the real reason was to discuss the administrations of Roosevelt as a unit. Yet in terms of the way the international scene changed, 1929 would seem to have been a more realistic stopping point. And if the purpose was to describe American, rather than Rooseveltian, policy it would still be a valid decision. Roosevelt in his first years as President showed no great international consciousness.

Nevins preaches the doctrine of collective security, and so is very critical of the senate's failure to approve our joining the League or the World Court. Even more strongly does he condemn our economic nationalism as largely responsible for the coming of World War II. Naturally he commends strongly the policies of Cordell Hull and also those of Roosevelt after 1936, except for the precipitateness in proclaiming the "unconditional surrender" objective at Casablanca and of the agreements at Yalta.

Nevins does not offer any real explanation for what he calls the moral lassitude of the American people in the twenties and early thirties. That explanation may be offered in other volumes of the new series. Yet the disillusionment and cynicism of the people at corruption in high places, at the general rejection of the ideals of making the world safe for democracy, must be considered along with the effects of many years of attacks on religious and philosophical principles of right conduct. Some of the explanation, not hinted at by Nevins, shows clearly in the pages of Merton's *Seven Storey Mountain.*

As a final comment one should mention that the name of Charles A. Beard does not appear in the bibliography of either volume.

P. Raymond Nielson

The Creighton University

Union Policies in the Leather Industry. By Leo Cyril Brown, S.J. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1947. Pp. xviii, 246. $3.50.)

This closely reasoned study of a turbulent union in an unstable industry is almost unique in the current literature of labor unionism. Father Brown has made a distinguished contribution to that literature in his pioneering effort to analyze and appraise the economic factors which, if they do not determine, in the long run condition, union policies and actions—for both leaders and rank and file.

The industry which he chose for the setting of his study is highly volatile. It responds to many speculative factors not related to the productive process at all, such as prices of raw materials and finished goods. These and similar factors often overshadow production costs and techniques in management decisions on plant location, wage policies (in union as against non-union plants), or the introduction of new machinery. Added to these extraneous influences are the effects of seasonal supply and demand, highly diversified (and competitive) ownership, and shifting types of production. None of these and related elements in management organization and policies is neglected in this study. All are subjected to careful scrutiny and searching statistical analysis—as a background for appraising union policies in such an industry. Had the author ended with his study of the industry's evolutionary organizational pattern, this volume would have been an important addition to our knowledge of economic habits and responses. His industrial location analysis is of particular value in understanding of an often neglected aspect of management decision.

On the union side, the picture Father Brown draws indicates pretty clearly that unionism is deeply affected by the index of economic instability of the industry in which it operates. A brief review of the rise of many separate unions before the 1930's provides the setting for an account of the efforts—only partially successful—to integrate the existing unions in the following decade. Not less important in determining union policies were efforts to penetrate the predominant non-union plants—again only partially successful. Both drives were, as he demonstrates, conditioned by the economics of the industry which he had already analyzed and by the diversified management control of the industry. Such policies of vital concern to the union as wage differentials (between regions or union and non-union plants), the introduction of labor-saving machinery, and seniority systems were all deflected by these economic factors. Again, an extraneous factor such as the diverse racial composition of various locals affected union policies to some extent. Father Brown's general conclusion, that employment demand in the industry will decline from ten to twenty percent, only underlines the impact of the economic factors he traces so clearly on union long-run (as well as immediate) policy.

This study is a major contribution to our understanding of the union movement itself in a small but viable industry (we all must wear shoes!). It charts a new course for similar studies of union policy-conditioning and making in other industries. Father Brown has set the benchmark high for his successors.

PHILLIPS BRADLEY

Syracuse University

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Bartolomé de las Casas. By Lewis Hanke. Prologue by D. Fernando Ortiz. Translated by Antonio Hernández Travieso. (Habana: Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País. 1949. Pp. xlv, 126.)

This series of lectures, which Mr. Hanke delivered both at the University of Virginia and in Havana, Cuba, offers the student neither the panegyric nor the diatribe which has become almost the custom in publications on las Casas. Instead, this volume offers a judicious and mature appreciation by an eminent scholar of the contributions made to the sciences of history, anthropology, and political theory by the protector of the Indians. Both the merits and the demerits of this unique man are duly noted.

Thus the author freely acknowledges that las Casas did exaggerate the numbers of Indians slain in the conquest, that some authors claim that he falsified documents, and that his style is frequently so involved that many students are discouraged from even attempting to read his complete works. However, las Casas' inability to reckon census figures accurately was not unique in the sixteenth century. The claim that he falsified documents remains a mere claim since the assertions have never been proven. There does remain the barrier of style and it is hoped that the editors of the promised modern edition of las Casas' main works may be able to do something in this regard.

The main value of this book lies in its appreciation of the positive value of the great Dominican's work. Here the author is at his best. In broad clear strokes, buttressed with an astounding wealth of incidental citations, Mr. Hanke details again the thrilling story of the struggle of Montesinos and las Casas for the recognition of the rights of the Indians as fully fledged members of the human race. The results of this struggle changed substantially the course of Spanish colonial legislation. Another result of this struggle, almost a by-product, was the history of the Spanish conquest from 1492 to 1520 as well as a detailed account of many phases of Indian civilizations then extant in the Americas.

The author does well to single out for special mention the historical and anthropological works of las Casas. For, while many appreciate the mag-

nitude of his contribution to political theory, too few even today seem to realize the value of his efforts in the fields of history and anthropology. It is for this broader appreciation of his work that students of Latin America should be grateful to the author. They should be grateful as well to the Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País whose generosity made these lectures available to the general public.

ANTONINE S. TIBESAR

The Catholic University of America

Sonora. A Description of the Province. By Ignaz Pfefferkorn, S.J. Translated and annotated by Theodore E. Treutlein. [Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, Vol. XII.] (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1949. Pp. xv, 329. $9.50.)

Father Pfefferkorn, a German Jesuit, who had been eleven years in Sonora at the time his order was expelled from all Spanish possessions in 1767, carried back to his native Germany valuable information about the Indians of his mission territory and a prodigious store of geographical, historical, and ethnographical facts. These he wove into an account so vivid and alive that the reader who is encouraged by the author's delightful style to read through the two volumes is rewarded with a wealth of information. The missionary's first plan was to compile a three-volume treatise on Sonora. Since only two volumes were completed the inference is that he died before the third one was organized. The work was first published in Cologne in 1794-1795. The present translation from the German merits high praise and justly wins for Dr. Treutlein the claim that it "is more than a translation; it is the recreation into a new idiom by a modern historical scholar of the missionary's writings."

Volume one is primarily a "natural history." The author writes at length about herbs used for medicinal purposes, and speaks with simplicity of the kind Providence that provided so many remedies to a savage people who were without physicians or surgeons. Father Pfefferkorn distinguished between legendary cures and those he himself witnessed. He speaks appreciatively of the abundance of mineral wealth and of the fertility of the soil, but he never fails to say that the Americans, meaning the Indians, were indifferent to both. He did not dwell on beauty. The Indians obviously supplied little and either Pfefferkorn did not appreciate or did not discover great natural beauty in his surroundings.

In the second volume the Jesuit distinguished among the tribes, pointing out that some were more receptive of Christian teachings than others. The Sonorans he found most inept. They had no notion of God or a First Cause, nor were they interested. They did have some idea of the devil,

but they were not devil worshippers. These Sonorans were in a low state of barbarism; they lacked all feelings of love, hate, fear; were indolent and licentious; remained indifferent to pain and were unmoved by sorrow. They had great physical strength, could outrun a fast horse and maintain their speed for hours without any apparent fatigue. They seldom did anything artistic, but if they undertook to do so they showed rather remarkable skill.

The expelled Jesuit missionary takes occasion to disabuse his readers who may have heard the Spanish charge that the Jesuits used their missions to amass wealth, were negligent in the execution of their spiritual duties, or connived with authority for personal power. His simple account is a vindication more convincing than a well turned apologia. While Father Pfefferkorn could hardly have felt a personal admiration for the Spanish government that expelled his religious order from the empire and imputed to its members dishonesty, intrigue, and self-seeking, yet he is most fair in judging the Spanish colonial system. He is fair and impartial, moreover, in supplying evidence to show that individual Spaniards by their good lives and fraternal charity won the savages to civilization and Christianity while other individual Spaniards demoralized the converted Indians by their perfidious dealings.

The account is strictly personal. When the author shares with his readers information he gleaned from fellow missionaries or from other sources he avoids the mechanics of scholarship; yet he does not neglect authorities in establishing his opinions. His account is to be read for enjoyment; nevertheless, the historian will find in it a wealth of information that has been shrewdly appraised, carefully sifted, and creditably related.

SISTER MARY CRESCENTIA THORNTON

Clarke College

Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes. By Joseph H. L. Schlarman. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. xiv, 640. $5.00.)

Several published reviews of this book indicate the hurry of the reviewers in reading the volume, and their judgments turn out to be equally superficial. For no more solid history of Mexico has appeared in our language than this present work. It is, of course, attuned to the ear of our country with a special material environment and non-conformist culture, and an exacting demand for specific citation and single fact. This study depends on scholarly products from below the Rio Grande for its data. Its particular merit lies in its composition. One finds here a real unity in Mexican history, built on the only true basis of any history, the factual character of the people concerned. The author's style is anything but

volcanic. It is urbane, moderate, rigidly fair, sometimes even chatty as the various new phases are introduced. But the cumulative effect of the narrative is tremendous. Volcanic forces lie beneath the story of our sister nation. It was so in the day of Cortes, and more emphatically since the dawn of independence.

As one proceeds through the story he finds unusual stress laid on the Moorish influence exercised on the Spaniard. Louis Bertrand furnished that theme. Then, in turn, come the normal developments, the discovery and the organization of the new land, the expansion of the empire in North America, and the most remarkable feat of the Spaniard, viz., the full transfer of Iberian civilization to the western world. Here the reader grows in confidence, for he sees that he is finding the master theme of a heroic drama: *el sentido misional.* The Spaniard had a mission and the missionaries fulfilled it. These agents of cultural transmission stand forth with no apology. They found barbarians and they left a people who, no matter what they lost in the turmoil since 1810, retain their Christian politeness. "The Mexican peon, untouched and uncontaminated by his instructed neighbor, is still the gentleman."

Anyone who has tackled the job of Mexico realizes what he has to overthrow in the mountain of clichés built by the sociological writers. He must face the factual situation. And here he discovers that the colonial harmony was destroyed by the very men whose interest it was to retain it, the Bourbon regime shortly before 1800. These rulers gave the example of repudiation of trust. They confiscated without repayment, dissolved corporations on no basis of trial before a court, and turned guns on Indians who protested the dismemberment of their mission system. What wonder that a Hidalgo murdered his prisoners and that revolutionary generals became the great *hacendados* after despoiling the Spaniards and the religious orders!

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries carry on that theme. Only one president finished his term in the first fifty years. A scorn for justice gained the aura of respectability under the impact of positivism. Elections meant plain fraud. The McLane-Ocampo treaty proposition is on the books, unpleasant reading for the United States public, though to our credit the senate disdained to ratify it. So, too, is the record to show that we used religion as an instrument of foreign policy in a miserable attack on the culture of Mexico.

This volume is forthright, as it is complete. It has minor omissions and a few bits of oversight such as placing the Pine Ridge Reservation in California. The social character of property might have been more fully described (p. 391). The absence of bishops and the consequent degeneration of the *clericazos* should be in the story of the independence movement, though that episode receives an extended and enlightening treatment.

Cardenas is put where he belongs, as the man who brought Garrido Canabal into his cabinet. The epilogue closes gracefully with a note of thanks to the American ambassador in Mexico.

On the point of utility, this manual would make a completely satisfying text for a college course on Mexico. Its thirty closely printed pages of footnotes support each important statement of fact in the narrative. Ten pages of bibliography illustrate practically every name of consequence in the field. The movement of the story is clear, the manner objective. And the great problem, the struggle toward actual self-government, will grip a student who wants to understand his fellowman.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Xavier University
Cincinnati

The Life of Joaquim Nabuco. By Carolina Nabuco. Translated and edited by Ronald Hilton. (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1950. Pp. xxv, 373. $5.00.)

The subject of this biography, Joaquim Nabuco (1849-1910), was one of the most illustrious and attractive figures in Brazilian history. Almost from birth he was a public figure, so close to the greater events of Brazil in his time that the author is able, without straining, to tell much of the history of that nation from 1879 to 1910 merely by recounting the public life of Nabuco. Nabuco was a man of great gifts, a literateur, an orator, a parliamentarian, an historian, a diplomat. He might have turned his career in any one of those directions and been a success. He turned to all and was successful at all. He entered the parliament of the Brazilian Empire in 1879. His attention then was centered on the abolition of slavery. When his efforts toward that end were blocked in parliament, he launched an abolition movement in the empire that was largely responsible for the end of slavery in 1888. But the end of slavery also brought the end of the empire and the advent of the republic. A constitutional monarchist by conviction, Nabuco remained aloof from the new government for a decade to lead the monarchist cause. When his patriotism continued to outweigh his monarchist hopes, he broke his ten-year exile from governmental life in 1899 to represent the republic in the diplomatic struggle with Britain over the Guiana boundary. From then until his death in 1910 he was Brazil's outstanding diplomat. In 1905 he became Brazil's first ambassador to the United States, at which post he labored with great success to develop and cement Brazilian-American friendship and to further the cause of Pan-Americanism.

This biography by his daughter, Dona Carolina Nabuco, appeared first in Brazil in 1928 and went through several editions. Its translation into English in 1949 was Stanford's contribution to the centenary of Nabuco's birth. Its publication in 1950 coincided with Stanford's Conference on Brazil. The chief translator and editor, Ronald Hilton, has prefaced the present volume with an introduction that is a brief resume of Brazilian history since independence, "to give the nonspecialist the essential historical background for an understanding of the book." Hilton and his collaborators have made some changes in the original text, although there is no way of knowing where these changes occur.

This reviewer feels that the Stanford men have put a bit too much emphasis on Stanford's contribution to this work and too little on the author's part but, perhaps, this emphasis is warranted as a reward for making the volume available to the English-reading public. Incidentally, while referring to the illustrious progeny of Nabuco, mention is made of the author and her brother, Mauricio Nabuco, the present Brazilian ambassador to the United States. Nothing is said of another son, Monsignor Joachim Nabuco, one of Brazil's leading churchmen.

The intention of the author was to present the story of her famous father's public life rather than his private life. However, she did not keep to that plan faithfully and there is very much of Nabuco's private life scattered through the pages of the book. She gives enough of Nabuco's private life to arouse the reader's curiosity to know more, then leaves that curiosity unsatisfied. At times there is a patch-work quality about this biography that is a bit confusing, a considerable overlapping of topics, and the repeated re-introduction of subjects that have already been discussed elsewhere. The attempt to present the material chronologically and topically at one and the same time explains some of this confusion. The book has far too much direct quotation. The digesting of Nabuco's letters and speeches is often left to the reader when it should have been done by the author. This condition gets progressively worse as the story develops so that by the time Chapter XXIII, "Life in Rome," is reached there is nothing but a diary-like parade of excerpts with no comment from the author throughout the entire chapter.

Despite these weaknesses this is a fine work, an important book for the American reader, reflecting not only much of the history of Brazil during the period of Nabuco's life but revealing also many sides of a man who must be considered one of the most lovable and capable statesmen of modern times.

ROBERT J. WELCH

State University of Iowa

NOTES AND COMMENTS

It is gratifying to note the warm reception given by non-Catholic historians to the works of Catholic scholars in other parts of the world. Especially striking was the review of Father Philip Hughes' new volume, *The Reformation in England,* which appeared over the initials A. O. in the *Oxford Magazine* of February 1, 1951 (LXIX, 242-244). The review opened by saying, "This is one of the rare books which it is almost an impertinence to praise." After two laudatory columns it ended with the sentence: "If England is ever to be re-won to the papal allegiance, if a parlous Christendom is ever to be inspired to close its ranks, it will be by honest writing of this kind." The historian of the Church could scarcely hope for higher praise than this and it exemplifies once more the good that is done by writing history in the candid manner which has characterized all of Father Hughes' books. In this connection it is pleasant to record the appearance of a revised edition of Eris O'Brien's *The Foundation of Australia (1786-1800),* which was originally published in 1937 by Sheed and Ward in London. In a foreword to the revised edition John M. Ward, Challis professor of history in the University of Sydney, says that the volume of Dr. O'Brien, who is Coadjutor Archbishop of Sydney, "has won an unexcelled reputation in Australian historical scholarship." The scholarly publications of Archbishop O'Brien and Father Hughes are in the best traditions of von Pastor and Duchesne and give point to the fact that the type of history upon which Pope Leo XIII set the seal of his high authority in his famous letter on historical studies of August 18, 1883, is, fortunately, very much with us. Thus is there being fulfilled the object which the Pontiff had in mind when he opened the Vatican Archives to scholars in 1879 and in this way gave a tremendous impetus to the scientific and thorough writing of the history of the Church.

An exhibition of photography by Matthew B. Brady, the famous Civil War photographer, recently opened in the exhibition hall at the National Archives in Washington, D. C. Catholic visitors to the nation's capital this spring noted with special interest three excellent pictures which showed how their forebears joined with their fellow countrymen in the Civil War. Two of these photographs represent women religious who nursed among the Union soldiers during that conflict and to whom is dedicated the monument which stands in front of St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington. One of these full length studio pictures is that of Sister M. Joseph of the Sisters of Mercy of New York City, who served voluntarily with seven companions at a military hospital in Beaufort, North

Carolina, and struggled with the problem of caring for the wounded without proper equipment. The other photograph is of Sister Ann Cecilia of the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, one of about thirty of her community who served as nurses. Facing the hardships of the ambulance wagons and hospital tents of that day, she did duty for a time at Culpeper, Virginia, where typhoid was prevalent. The third Catholic scene in the Brady exhibition is that of an Army chaplain in full Mass vestments as if reading to his men in front of an open tent in which an altar stands. The soldiers were members of the famous 69th New York State Militia. The picture was probably taken at Fort Corcoran on Arlington Heights, where they were encamped in defense of the city of Washington. The chaplain was most likely Father Bernard O'Reilly, S.J., who had recently taken the place of Father Thomas H. Mooney, the pastor of St. Bridget's Church in New York City. Shortly thereafter the 69th marched to Bull Run and on July 26, 1861, when battle was joined, 133 of their members were killed.

Two recent publications of the National Archives should interest American historians. In the 1950 reissue of the booklet, *Your Government's Records in the National Archives,* first prepared in 1945, there is found a description of the 266 records groups in the archives as of March, 1950. In the four-page introduction describing the work of the records agency of the national government the claim is made: "Comparatively speaking, the records in the National Archives as materials for research in such fields as history, biography, economics, sociology, political science, and public administration have hardly been touched" (p. vii). The encouragement toward their use is demonstrated by another 1950 publication, *List of Microcopies of the National Archives.* Positive prints of the bodies of records listed therein which are on file in negative microfilm at the archives are available at cost. The microcopies provide filmed title pages and introductory notes. Under the diplomatic and consular instructions of the Department of State are listed the instructions sent to our ministers to the Papal States from 1848 to 1868. These records which on film amount to fourteen feet are, of course, part of the material edited by Leo F. Stock in *United States Ministers to the Papal States. Instructions and Dispatches, 1848-1868* (Washington, 1945).

Through Monsignor William L. Newton, the former secretary of the editorial board for the revision of the New Testament, the Department of Archives and Manuscripts of the Catholic University of America has recently accessioned ten inches of records of that body. The material includes minutes of meetings, correspondence, critical comments, and other notes on the work of preparing the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine version. It will constitute in good part the sources for any study of this unique project in American Catholic scholarship.

The Mullen Library of the Catholic University of America, in cooperation with the libraries of Georgetown University and St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois, has completed a microfilm edition of the American Catholic Directories from 1817-1879. Available on eight reels of 35mm. film, it can be purchased as a set or in individual reels through the Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C., which has issued a two-page descriptive circular of the edition. The set is extremely important to scholars and students, since it contains source material for the history of the Church, the development of Catholic education, and the growth of Catholic charities and other movements. Historians of individual religious orders find it very useful for its fairly complete listings of institutions.

For the fifty-fifth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science held at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, April 6-7, 1951, the general topic presented was "Lessons from Asia." Many of the speakers were natives of the countries under discussion and delegates in important international organizations. Other speakers were authors of books on the history and government of the peoples of the Middle East and the Far East. The subject matter of the meeting was covered in six sessions and the themes presented were as follows: Totalitarianism and Democracy, The East and the West: Two Views, Interpretation by Asians, Fundamentals in Asia, and How Others View Us. The American Catholic Historical Association was represented by Edward J. McCarthy, O.S.A., of Villanova College and Sister M. Catharine Joseph Haughey of Immaculata College.

The forty-fifth volume of the Catholic Record Society of England contains important source materials hitherto unpublished for the history of the Church in England since the time of Henry VIII. The Catholic Record Society was founded in 1904 and during the period of almost a half century since its establishment it has published many valuable documents for a study of the Catholic Church in England. Like all learned societies it is feeling the pinch of rising costs of printing and paper. The annual subscription remains at only one guinea. The society merits the support of students of the history of the Church in all lands. The secretary may be addressed at 33 Wilfred Street, London, S.W. 1, England.

An American sub-committee of the International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions was appointed at the Chicago meeting of the A.H.A. in December, 1950. The purposes of the Commission are in part to support the publications by the University of Louvain of the *Etudes présentées à la commission internationale pour l'histoire des assemblées d'états.*

The third annual conference of the Scottish Catholic Historical Committee was held on March 31-April 1 at Fatima House, Goodham Kilmarnock, Ayrshire. The committee was founded in 1949 with the approval of the Scottish hierarchy for the purposes of furthering research in Scottish Catholic history and of hunting out and making available the sources for the history of the Church in Scotland. The committee has published a brochure, *Glasgow University and the Catholic Church,* and it likewise has its own journal entitled: the *Innes Review.* The annual subscription for the latter is 5s. or one dollar. It began publication in June, 1950, and is published semiannually. The interesting articles of the first two issues are listed in our section on periodical literature. Persons interested in the work of the society may address the secretary, Miss M. P. Murray, at 59 Gala Street, Riddrie, Glasgow, Scotland.

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Mediaeval Academy of America was held April 24-25 at the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, Washington, D. C. The following papers were presented: "The Scrolls of Mount Sinai," by A. S. Atiya; "New Light on the Venetian *Podestà* in Constantinople, 1204-1261," by Robert Lee Wolff; "The Middle Ages—Continuity or Contrast," by Francis L. Utley; and "Methods of Carolingian Construction—Fulrad's Church at St. Denis," by Sumner McKnight Crosby. Professor Crosby's address, illustrated with moving pictures, was particularly well received. At the dinner on April 24 Barnaby C. Keeney and Sidney Painter debated in sprightly fashion on the political ideas of the English barons in the thirteenth century.

A three-day session, April 26-28, was devoted to the annual symposium on Byzantine studies at Dumbarton Oaks. The papers, all grouped about the subject of iconoclasm, were as follows: "The Image in the Writings of the Greek Fathers," by Gerhardt B. Ladner; "Iconoclastic Movements in Armenia," by Sirarpie Der Nersessian; "The Seventh Oecumenical Council," by Milton V. Anastos; "The Patriarch Nicephorus," by Paul J. Alexander; "The Triumph of Orthodoxy—Celebration and Iconography," by André Grabar; "Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," by Francis Dvornik; and "The Descent into Hell and the Anastasis," and "The Pictorial Answer to Iconoclasm: The Mosaics of the Church of the Holy Apostles," both by A. M. Friend, Jr., director of the highly successful and stimulating sessions.

On April 26 the University of Notre Dame sponsored a lecture at the J. Pierpont Morgan Library by A. Gabriel, O.Praem., in which he discussed mediaeval miniatures illustrative of educational methods. Father Gabriel is working on this subject at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University, where he is on leave of absence from the University of Notre Dame.

The College of Notre Dame of Maryland devoted the day of April 6 to a program of scholarly papers on mediaeval subjects by various members of its faculty. In the evening the students presented a mystery play.

A conference on Italy's contribution to culture was held on April 7 under the auspices of the Department of Italian of Columbia University. Seven papers were presented. Professor Howard R. Marraro presided.

Bruno Walter's conducting of Verdi's *Requiem* at the Metropolitan Opera in New York on Good Friday and Holy Saturday, March 23-24, as part of the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the composer's death, brought out the interesting fact that the American première of this great classic was performed in St. Ann's Church on East Twelfth Street in New York as a benefit for the poor on Sunday evening, October 25, 1874. The performance was due to the enterprise of Louis Dacheur, music director at St. Ann's, and although the orchestra was replaced by the organ, the chorus was small, and the soloists were rated as only passable the event stirred great interest in musical circles and was favorably reviewed in the New York *Times* and other city papers. At the time Father Thomas S. Preston, vicar general of the archdiocese, was pastor of St. Ann's. Forty years before the American première of Verdi the *Requiem* by Mozart was performed for the first time in the United States at St. John's Church, Philadelphia, on April 29, 1834, by an Italian opera company then filling an engagement at the Chestnut Street Theater. St. John's had been opened two years before the Mozart première under Father John Hughes, the future Archbishop of New York.

Robert D. Quirk, O.S.B., dean and professor of history in St. Anselm's College, delivered the principal address at the dinner meeting of the Northern New England Historians Conference held at Dartmouth College on October 14, 1950. Father Quirk's subject was "The Benedictines—Past, Present, and Future."

Mother Florence M. Bourret of San Francisco College for Women won the award for European history granted by the Pacific Coast Branch of the A.H.A. for her volume, *The Gold Coast. A Survey of the Gold Coast and British Togoland, 1919-1946* (Stanford, 1949), which was reviewed in this journal in the issue of October, 1950, pp. 347-348.

Simon A. Baldus, for many years a member of the American Catholic Historical Association, retired as managing editor of *Extension Magazine* on April 1. Mr. Baldus joined the Catholic Church Extension Society as an assistant to Father Francis C. Kelley almost at the beginning of the organization and helped in the editing of *Extension Magazine*, which in May, 1907, became a monthly publication. In 1946 Mr. Baldus was decorated by Pope Pius XII with the cross *Pro Ecclesia*.

Charles H. Metzger, S.J., of West Baden College has been granted a leave of absence for the first semester of the coming academic year for research and writing.

Madeleine Hooke Rice has been advanced to the rank of assistant professor of history at Hunter College.

The April number of the *Americas* publishes an obituary notice of Livarius Oliger, O.F.M., distinguished historian, who died in Rome on January 29.

Documents: Lettre de Dom Pierre Coustant à Dom Martène. G. Charvin (*Revue Mabillon,* Oct.)—Les Documents de Lévis aux Archives canadiennes. Lucien Brault (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française,* Mar.).—Correspondance autour de la question scolaire du Nouveau-Brunswick, 1873. Lionel Groulx *(ibid.).*—Bishop Fleming's Visitation of Newfoundland, 1834-1835. Thomas F. O'Connor (*The Americas,* Apr.).

The following letter addressed to the managing editor of the *Review* will be of interest to all our readers in view of the announcement made in the spring concerning the microfilming of the manuscript collections in the Vatican Library.

May 22, 1951

Reverend John Tracy Ellis
Managing Editor
Catholic Historical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

Dear Father Ellis:

There have been so many incorrect press notices about St. Louis University's project to microfilm materials in the manuscript collections of the Vatican Library that I wonder if you would be willing to print in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW a brief news item concerning the project so that the scholarly world may have accurate information as to the origin of the project, probable content of material, and conditions of usage? Probably this would be a real service to historians in the field of medieval history, philosophy, theology, and the social sciences in general. Also, this is the first release that St. Louis University has formally made about the project.

As you know, we established a Medieval Institute at the University some two years ago. Our library holdings in scholastic philosophy are very good and in a few instances unique. Because of the wisdom of Father Pierre Jean DeSmet and other Jesuits in the 1830's we happen

to possess many of the printed sources in the historical and theological fields. However, our resources needed augmenting in order to carry on successfully medieval studies on a high scholarly level. We naturally turned to photographic reproduction in those fields to make available certain of the printed source collections we lacked. Slowly we also began to collect manuscript materials on microfilm. This process quite naturally led to considering acquisition of microfilm copies of materials in the Vatican manuscript collections. Inquiries led us to feel that, perhaps, in restricted fields a project to microfilm extensively might receive approbation from the Vatican. Fortunately, authorities at the Vatican Library looked with great favor on such a project. Their position clearly was one of interest in making it possible for the wealth of material in the Vatican manuscript collections to be made more readily accessible to scholars in the Western world. That this was the motive for granting any favor at all was eminently clear in our conferences with the library authorities while I was in Rome surveying the collections.

Since the project will probably be quite extensive the funds needed were in excess of what St. Louis University could itself afford. We have been fortunate in receiving a grant which we think will probably meet operational costs if we are able to avoid administrative overhead and such adjuncta as are so often connected with this sort of work. The actual work of microfilming is now in progress. Duration of the task will greatly depend on many variable factors which make it next to impossible to determine when we will be ready to have materials available for use in the United States. I should judge that it will take us at least ten months to a year before we can hope to have materials ready for the use of scholars. Technical details in this sort of project are many and quite complicated as you know from working with Mr. Eugene P. Willging at the Catholic University of America on similar operations. We have fortunately obtained the good offices of Mr. Edward T. Freel, Manager of the Microfilm Division of Remington-Rand, to act as consultant in insuring excellency of material, equipment, and the highest quality of reproduction.

Concerning the nature of the material to be microfilmed, we originally requested permission to copy medieval materials pertaining to history, philosophy, theology, and the social sciences in general. When we discussed the project with authorities in Rome permission was extended in such wise that for practical purposes we hope to be able to microfilm as many as possible of those manuscripts in collections which would have any value by way of preserving them and which would not be available outside of the actual depository in Rome. Probably the copying will not be absolutely complete since there are many duplications in these collections whose reproduction would be a waste of funds. We will, however, strive to be certain that whatever is not available in the United States

and of pertinence will be copied. We do not plan to copy much of the illuminated material since most of this is biblical only and of value chiefly because of its lovely illuminations. We shall copy some chiefly for purposes of illustration rather than for content.

The Vatican has been most generous regarding the use of the material. Conditions for usage as laid down are similar to those for using materials in the Vatican itself. Any reputable scholar may be granted free access to the copies. Photostat or microfilm reprints may be made for scholars on request. Thus it seems to me evident that the favor is by no means granted to St. Louis University alone but to American scholars in general. We hope to copy all control media available in the Vatican so that users may be able to find what they are seeking. We have not as yet gotten around to detailed consideration of what might be done about publishing the control media. This would be the most desirable move and perhaps it could be worked out, or at least some close approach to that.

Here at St. Louis University we feel that American scholarship has been granted a great boon. We consider ourselves merely the service organization through which the treasure may be handled. We are certain that particularly the members of the American Catholic Historical Association will hail this new treasure as a great acquisition for the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph P. Donnelly, S.J.
Director of Libraries
St. Louis University

BRIEF NOTICES

SMITH, VINCENT EDWARD. *Idea-Men of Today.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. x, 434. $5.00.)

Dr. Smith, professor of philosophy in the University of Notre Dame and author of *Philosophical Frontiers of Physics* and *Philosophical Physics*, has now added a most useful volume for historians who need to know the philosophical cross-currents for a proper understanding of the recent past and immediate present. As every historian is aware, the war of ideas has today reached a new intensity. This work is divided into four parts. The first part traces the background for the contemporary philosophers or philosophical schools who are grouped into two large families to constitute the second and third parts. In the first group are included studies of Dewey's instrumentalism, Santayana's esthetics, Whitehead's organicism, Bertrand Russell's logical positivism, Freud's psychoanalysis, and Karl Marx's dialectical materialism. In the third part studies are made of Bergson, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Sartre, Jaspers, and the spiritual existentialists. The basic principles of each philosopher studied are first outlined in each instance with such observations interspersed as seem necessary for greater clarity. Then follows the author's criticism in outline form suitable for the study-club purpose for which the essays were originally written. The last part is a summary of the several fundamental trends found emerging from the collective thought of all the philosophers considered.

Professor Smith is careful to let each philosopher speak for himself insofar as the philosopher is able to make his position known clearly. When that is not the case the author gives his own judgment of what he thinks the philosopher is trying to say. His critical judgments at the close of each essay are eminently fair. This does not prevent a very forthright conclusion as to the error or irrationality of a position where that seems definitely warranted. Several years of careful study of sources have gone into the making of this scholarly and readable volume. It is made to order for the professional historian who has not the time or, perhaps, the philosophical training to master this broad field by his own study but who is well aware of the tremendous importance of contemporary ideas in this age of facile communication. (CHARLES A. HART)

STAMPP, KENNETH M. *And the War Came: The North and the Secession Crisis, 1860-1861.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1950. Pp. viii, 331. $4.50.)

A passage from Lincoln's second inaugural address provides the misty title of this book which trenchantly analyzes the events which transpired between the election of Lincoln and the fall of Fort Sumter. The presentation is topical rather than chronological, interpretative rather than descriptive. Much of the data is drawn from newspaper files but the book is not a study of public opinion. It is an

exposure of political manipulation with emphasis on the transition from oratorical fireworks to genuine gunfire.

The author's thesis is that the Republican Party was unalterably opposed to compromises and those proposed were superficial or insincere. Secession was the last hope for a peaceful solution of a situation which had long been evolving. It failed because nationalism with its unifying implications had infected and inflamed the Republicans. More important still, business men goaded politicians on to stop the expanding economic paralysis. They saw government securities faltering. Southern debts might be repudiated; southern markets might be lost. So also the control of the Mississippi River. Political instability could, in fact, endanger all property and prosperity. According to Dr. Stamp the South was slyly made to appear as the aggressor while northern self-interest in reality precipitated the war. It cloaked itself in self-righteousness and deluded so many people that even the American Peace Society announced that it did not see fit to "countenance or tolerate rebellion." (BENJAMIN J. BLIED)

STEWARD, JULIAN H. (Ed.). *Handbook of South American Indians.* Vol. 5. The Comparative Ethnology of South American Indians. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1949. Pp. xxvi, 818. $3.00.)

This volume on the Comparative Ethnology of South American Indians is the next to last in this monumental *Handbook* series. In contradistinction to the first four volumes, which are arranged regionally and by tribes, in this fifth volume the topical approach is employed. An effort is made to give for each topic the continental distribution. Most of this material has not before been presented on such a scale and many of the contributors interpret their data spatially and chronologically.

There are four major parts, of which the first, A Cross-cultural Survey of South American Indian Tribes, is by far the most extensive (pp. 1-644). In it are treated the following subjects: architecture and engineering; manufacture and technology; social and political life; esthetic and recreational activities; religion and shamanism; lore and learning. Each of these is further subdivided, and in some cases the sections are handled by several authors respectively. E. g., under esthetic and recreational activities, Kroeber deals with art,—as distinct from technology; Rouse, with petroglyphs; Cooper, with games and gambling, as well as with stimulants and narcotics. Some topics such as clothing and mythology, which one would expect in a survey of the kind are, unfortunately but unavoidably lacking, as explained by the editor (p. xxii).

Historians will be more especially interested, perhaps, in Part II, Métraux' short but comprehensive survey of the Jesuit missions, an unbiased and well-balanced interpretation of their influence on the Indians. The editor of the *Handbook,* J. H. Steward, gives what data are available on native populations in Part III, and in Part IV has himself made the interpretative summary of all the material, including even that from the forthcoming sixth and final volume. (REGINA FLANNERY HERZFELD)

SWANN, NANCY LEE (Trans. and Ed.). *Food and Money in Ancient China—The Earliest Economic History of China to A.D.25—Han Shu 24 with Related Texts, Han Shu 91 and Shi-chi 129.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 482 [79], of Chinese Text. $10.00.)

The core of this impressive work is constituted by an annotated translation of "Shih-huo Chih" (Treatise on Food and Money), the earliest extant economic history of China and one of the great pieces of Chinese historical literature, included in *Han Shu* (History of the Han Dynasty), chapter 24. A wealth of introductory material—comprising a political, legal, and military setting of the epoch, an analysis of the structure and contents of the Treatise on Geography to be found in *Han Shu* 28, an analysis of the structure and a chronological table of contents of the Treatise on Food and Money—leads the reader to a full understanding of the translated treatise.

The Treatise on Food and Money, given in text and translation, is divided into two parts: the first deals with agriculture in chronological order from prehistoric times to A.D. 25; the second part treats chronologically, from the twelfth century B.C. to the restoration of the House of Han in A.D. 25, government policies concerning commerce and industry, particularly the rise and fall of state monopolies of salt, iron, and liquors; the basic sources for revenues by direct taxation; currency standard and exchange; government control of coinage. The treatise is followed by important chapters on measurements, tax terms, Han money, rate of interest, and a war loan of 154 B.C., and by two related texts concerning occupational pursuits of certain wealthy persons, rich merchants, and industrialists.

Miss Swann hopes that into her translation "has been breathed something of the breath of life found in the original," for she strove to render the earliest extant economic history of China "in as literal a translation as good English allows" (p. 77). In the opinion of this reviewer, her interpretation and translation is clearer, fuller, more logical and elegant than the concise, forceful but choppy Chinese text. The excellence of Miss Swann's translation will be fully appreciated by both historians and Sinologs, especially by the former who are directly interested more in the significance of economic history and theories than that of individual terms and phrases. Miss Swann's work is one of the outstanding contributions of recent years to Sinology and economic history, a true mine of scholarly information, and a model of precise thinking and clear presentation. (ANTONIO SISTO ROSSO)

TAILLE, MAURICE DE LA, S.J. *The Mystery of Faith.* Book II: *The Sacrifice of the Church.* Translated by Archpriest Joseph Carroll, assisted by P. J. Dillon, S.J. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1950. Pp. xiii, 473. $5.50.)

Ten years have elapsed since the first part of Father de la Taille's *Mysterium Fidei* appeared in English translation. This second volume deals with the author's explanation of the sacrifice of the Mass or, as he himself chooses to call it, the sacrifice of the Church. When the *Mysterium Fidei* first appeared it caused something of a sensation in theological quarters. For some it seemed that the day of enlightenment had really dawned. Others, however, seemed to find more human mystery in the new explanation offered than explanation of the

divine Mystery itself. It is likely that the same divided opinion still exists.

Whenever a comparison of the Latin and English texts was made, the impression deepened that the translation was not so accurate as it should be in a work so important as this. The book has an adequate table of contents, but neither bibliography nor index. Perhaps, these latter elements are being reserved for the last volume. The format is, I think, more attractive than was that of the first volume with its double column on each page, and the print is easy on the eyes. Surely, those for whom a translation is not merely useful but essential for understanding Father de la Taille's theology concerning the great Mystery of the Faith must hope that the third and last part of the work will not be so long aborning. (LOUIS A. ARAND)

TEMPLE, PATRICK J. *Pattern Divine or Our Lord's Hidden Life.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1950. Pp. xii, 389. $5.00.)

This is an informative book but not an inspiring one. The style is lumbering and one is never sure whether the author is seeking to be the historian, religious philosopher, or spiritual writer. Certainly he has learning and a wide command of sources and as a compilation of what has been written on the hidden life in the scholarly world the work deserves a place in libraries.

Strangely enough it more than once appears that while the author has vast stores of knowledge on what others have written in regard to the hidden life, he seems not to have pondered equally well the one unexcelled source, the New Testament. For instance, one of the weakest spots in the book is his discussion of, "They understood not" (p. 220). Just a few lines are devoted on that page to the problem and Father Temple merely says that Mary and Joseph did not understand Jesus at the age of twelve. But previously the reader is left entirely vague as to the author's real meaning (p. 217). Apparently Mary did understand. Likewise, in discussing the relations between Jesus and the Baptist, the author has many surmises, but misses entirely the significant remark of the Baptist, "I did not know him" (*Jn.* 1, 31). The author takes for granted that Mary could read (p. 19), and very confidently argues that Christ spent three entire days with the learned men at the age of twelve (p. 208). Some of Father Temple's surmises are rather far-fetched, as that of finding "vestiges of the hidden years . . . in St. James' Epistles" (p. 295), and on the same page we find the strange remark that Christ "did not unduly respect the person of men." (WILLIAM H. RUSSELL)

TIMASHEFF, NICHOLAS S. *The Great Retreat. The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. 1946. Pp. 470. $5.00.)

This very interesting and brilliantly written survey of the evolution of the Soviet regime in Russia from its inception to the Stalinist phase of today, is a valuable contribution to the study of the economic and social conditions in the USSR. Yet, at the same time, it is a typical example of how far war-time enthusiasm succeeded in inspiring with an exaggerated optimism even our scholarly literature regarding Soviet Russia. In the light of our post-war experiences the main thesis of this book, so eloquently expressed in its title, can

hardly be regarded as tenable. Few will readily concede today that, under the impact of historical circumstances, the "Great Communist Experiment" of the 1920's was forced to retreat from its original, purely Communist positions and that, consequently, the influence of the resurgent nationalist traditions of pre-revolutionary Russia has so changed the socio-cultural existence of the USSR as to render it less incompatible with western standards.

Upon this "retreat," the author hopes, a future development of democratic forms in Russia and a strengthening of the policy of understanding and co-operation with the West may be based. "In the course of the Great Retreat, the Russian nation has broken the backbone of the Communist monster and, having broken it, experienced the joy of recovery and victory. . . . No longer having any desire to see their home rebuilt according to the Marxist blueprint, they will hardly help the government impose such a transfiguration on their neighbors" (p. 415). How far we are in 1950 from those optimistic prognostications of 1946. The "Great Retreat," alas, was but a Great Ruse! The book is accompanied by an excellent bibliography and a useful index. (OLGERD SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR)

TREVELYAN, GEORGE M. *An Autobiography and Other Essays.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1949. Pp. 237. $3.00.)

In this rather small volume, small at least for Trevelyan, several historical essays and biographies of the Master of Trinity are collected by his publishers. The book will probably have a rather limited appeal because of the topics discussed, but any reader who begins the first essay will find it difficult to put this work aside. George Macaulay Trevelyan's life effort to write history not only accurately but artistically and dramatically is crowned in these pages, especially when he discusses history and the reader (a must for every college social science student), bias in history, or the two-party system in English political history.

But the high point in the collection is naturally the author's first autobiography. He terms it, "The Autobiography of an Historian," and his legion of admirers will find therein the story of his family and academic life, the reasons which motivated him to write the books he did, and throughout an eloquent defense of history as both science and art. It is a balanced study of the development of a modern historical scholar, with the personal and private in his life well subordinated to his professional growth. Trevelyan's books take on new meaning and significance in the light of this short but enlightening self-study.

There are many provocative ideas in these pages on education, religion and poetry, social history, English literature, and the "great men" theme in history. The collection is like a series of conversations in which the fortunate reader corners Professor Trevelyan, mellow at the vesper hour. (COLMAN J. BARRY)

VALOIS, ROBERT, C.S.V. *Le Père François-Michel Roberge, sixième supérieur général des Clercs de Saint-Viateur, 1866-1941.* (Joliette, P. Q.: Les Clercs de Saint-Viateur, Maison Provinciale. 1949. Pp. 109.)

This brochure is the story of a French Canadian, born in the Province of Quebec, at St. Cuthbert de Berthier, on February 11, 1866, being the ninth of

ten children of a good Catholic family. Through six chapters we follow the hero first in the period of his primary and higher education, then in his entry into ecclesiastical life in 1886 and into religious life at the novitiate of the Clerics of St. Viator two years later, finally in his successive offices of educator, of superior of a seminary, of assistant general, vicar, and superior general from 1923 to 1937. The last chapter is devoted to Father Roberge's retirement and death. In all these stages the author shows the admirable activity and great merit of Father Roberge as well as the intense interior life which animated him. There is neither table of contents nor reference to sources. (CONRAD M. MORIN)

VINER, JACOB. *The Customs Union Issue.* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Pp. viii, 221. $2.50.)

This concluding volume of ten Studies in the Administration of International Law and Organization, has the merit of placing certain modern hopeful assumptions about customs unions in a context of economic and political history. In this context it appears that the "customs union is only a partial, uncertain, and otherwise imperfect means of doing what world-wide non-discriminatory reduction of trade barriers can do more fully, more certainly, and more equitably, and it will be a sad outcome of confused thinking on our part if we in effect abandon our pursuit of the greater economic goal because of our fresh, and romantic, infatuation with the lesser goal." The last seventy pages of the book are given over to lists of documents and references concerning past and present customs unions. (JOHN T. FARRELL)

WEISMAN, ELIZABETH WILDER. *Mexico in Sculpture, 1521-1821.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. 224. $7.50.)

"Golden" is the only word for this marvelous picture-story of the sculpture of Mexico. The rich and profuse excellence of decorative and inspirational stone carvings bewilders a reader who so constantly sees our southern neighbor portrayed as a very minor figure in the culture of modern times. Yet stone stands the erosion of time better than any other material in the pictorial arts, and Mexico is full of wonderful works for the student of this medium. The choice photographs here printed—there are 167 fine plates—tell the story even to an amateur, although something more than an amateur is required to evaluate the thorough history, as well as the command of aesthetic production, found in Dr. Weismann's narrative. The accompanying text carries on from the stone crosses through separate images, noble architectural compositions, sacred and domestic façades, to such notable interior works as the vault of the *camarin* of the Virgin of Loreto in the Tepotzotlan church of San Francisco Javier. As the writer notes of this striking edifice, there is nothing "like the effect of entering a humble Mexican church, roughly plastered, perhaps thatched, to find the interior rich with luminous gold." "Socially and economically," she says, "the implications are enormous. Here, somehow, is relief from political oppression and curtailment of life. Here is a first-rate work of art, in its fabulous convincing opulence, its surcease from poverty." And of the builders who donated their entire time for a year to raise

this chapel—a labor attacked by Valle as "the cruel coercion of the priests who forced people to such labor for so costly a shrine"—she justly condemns the attitude which shows a peculiar historical ignorance, not only of the quality of religious zeal but of the force of communal human enthusiasm in any sphere.
(W. EUGENE SHIELS)

WHITE, JOHN ALBERT. *The Siberian Intervention.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 471. $6.00.)

After the rise of the Soviet regime and its conclusion of the separate peace with the Central Powers in 1918, the Allies decided to intervene in the developing Russian civil war. American troops were sent to northern Russia and on August 16, 1918, an American force under General Graves landed in Vladivostok. The bulk of the intervention in Siberia was carried out by Japan which hoped to gain new territories as a result of the chaos prevailing after 1917 in the Russian Far East. For a time it seemed that the anti-Soviet regime set up in Siberia under the Supreme Leader Admiral Kolchak would be victorious; it had come into existence after a revolt of Czech legions had struck a shattering blow to Soviet rule in Asiatic Russia from the Volga to the Pacific. But the Kolchak regime collapsed in 1920. The same year brought the end of the intervention policy of the United States and the Allies. The development of world affairs forced reluctant Japan in 1922 to abandon all Russian territories occupied by her on the Asiatic continent. The Russian half of Sakhalin Island was given back to the Soviet Union only in 1925.

Mr. White's book describes these events with meticulous care. He has exploited fully the rich material on his subject available in the Hoover Library at Stanford University. His book is an important contribution for the study of the Soviet regime as well as of far eastern affairs. The geographical, historical, and economic background is carefully analyzed. There is, for instance, a very valuable chapter on the railways in the Russian Far East. The view that American intervention in Siberia had as main aim prevention of Japanese expansion is convincingly proved (e.g., pp. 261 ff.). Impressive also is the analysis of the causes of the defeat of the White armies, though the author betrays that Kolchak and his reactionary underleaders do not enjoy his sympathy. White is, of course, right in describing the fateful negative role which the cruelty of such anti-Bolsheviks as Semenov and Kalmukov played and in stating that the Japanese policy aiming at a weak Russia was in contradiction to the allied support of Kolchak, whose victory would have restored the Russian Empire. White absolves the Czechs and the French General Janin of any guilt for the abandonment of Kolchak to his enemies who later executed him.

The motives of the various intervening powers are clearly shown; the role of the expectation to establish again an eastern front against Germany is correctly presented, though the fear of the revolutionary Bolshevik propaganda is not enough emphasized. Despite some unnecessary repetitions, the book must be regarded as a model of a study on recent events. The hope may be expressed that the author will fulfill the promise made in his preface and present soon other volumes on the Soviet Union in the Far East. (WALDEMAR GURIAN)

WILLARD, JAMES F., WILLIAM A. MORRIS, and WILLIAM H. DUNHAM, JR. (Eds.). *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336.* Volume III, *Local Administration and Justice.* [Mediaeval Academy of America, Publication No. 56.] (Cambridge: The Academy. 1950. Pp. xviii, 285. $5.00.)

With obvious and painstaking care, the third and last volume of the English Government at Work has been brought to fruition about twenty years after its inception. The original editor and planner, Professor Willard, as well as several of his co-editors, has died since this scholarly undertaking was first conceived. However, it has been admirably completed by Professor Dunham and his associates who have continued with the initial aims and purposes of the work. Aside from the introductory narrative of Dunham there is an immense wealth of information about the everyday life of the England of Edward III contained in the eight chapters of this volume; especially those chapters on the manors and temporalities and on the mines and stannaries which may open up new fields of investigation on these subjects. Such distinguished historians as Professors Ault, Cam, and Putnam have contributed greatly to the intents and ambitions of Willard in producing a "functional treatment" of a ten-year period of local administration and the dispensation of justice in mediaeval England. It was a difficult objective to reach at best, but when such a project was engaged in by so many collaborators it became well-nigh impossible of fulfillment. Yet, in this case there is now a completed work on the period 1327-1336 which will provide ample attraction for scholars occupied with research in English history. (THOMAS E. LYNCH)

WILLIAMS, MELVIN J. *Catholic Social Thought.* (New York: Ronald Press. 1950. Pp. xv, 567. $5.00.)

There is much that can be said in favor of this book, in which Catholic historians will have an especial interest because it is written from an historical approach, and there are two chapters entitled respectively: "Social Trends in Contemporary Catholic Historical Thought," and "Representative Historical Contributions to Sociological Thought." Dr. Williams, a Methodist, has done a scrupulously objective piece of work, which will serve to correct some of the errors to be found in several non-Catholic histories of social thought.

The help of a number of Catholics is generously noted in the preface, but this reviewer, who is among them, did not see the manuscript since the spring of 1941 and it is possible that the others did not either. It is apparent that the book would have gained considerably by a Catholic collaborator with the insight which only a Catholic long in the field, and up-to-date in it, might be expected to possess.

To confine examples to those in which history specialists would be interested, Taparelli is missing in the political science section; Richard J. Purcell's important work in social history is not mentioned, nor, indeed, are many of the dissertations of the Catholic University of America's history department, although Father Furfey and the late Monsignor Cooper are praised for dissertations in history from their students in sociology and anthropology; French ecclesiastical his-

tory today is said to be based on "philosophical research" (p. 142), a statement somewhat nullified on page 154, and certainly not true if one regards the work of Gabriel LeBras, Pierre Deffontaines, Canon Boulard, and others (cf. *American Catholic Sociological Review*, XI, 1, 3-14). The author aims at including anyone who at any time was a Catholic. Therefore, he includes Herbert Agar in the history section, but for some reason omits D. W. Brogan (and also Montesquieu) and includes erroneously Otto von Gierke (p. 167) and Francis Bacon (p. 199). The statement reporting that Darwin "held to his faith in God" (p. 207), might be inaccurate, since he clearly declared himself an agnostic in later life: "The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I, for one must be content to remain an Agnostic" (Francis Darwin, *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, I, 282). Lists of names will prove confusing to the uninitiated, for experts are often placed in the middle of a group of journalists, or writers of but one mediocre book or article. Such printers' errors as M. J. Legrange (p. 154) for M. J. Legrand, and Albert LeRoy (p. 160) for Archbishop Alexandre LeRoy are immediately recognizable by the Catholic scholar, but not necessarily by others.

Despite this criticism, one must say that Dr. Williams' book gives Catholics their due place in the history of social thought, and one can only be grateful for the great amount of time and trouble which the author must have spent at his task, and the good proportion of valuable research which he has brought together. (Eva J. Ross)

Ynsfram, Pablo Max (ed.). *The Epic of the Chaco: Marshall Estigarribia's Memoirs of the Chaco War, 1932-1935.* (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1950. Pp. xiv, 221. $2.25.)

The Chaco War was a very costly and damaging experience to both Bolivia and Paraguay. It resulted from long unsettled boundary lines and the claim of both countries to the desert region known as the Chaco. The other American nations, including the United States, exhausted all diplomatic means in trying to avoid armed conflict. The unwillingness of the contending parties to compromise caused all efforts for peaceful settlement to fail and three years of war resulted.

The memoirs here presented are the record of that war from the Paraguayan side. The editor, a friend and co-worker of Marshal Estigarribia, has presented an attractive and useful work. The text of the book, written by Estigarribia, gives the account of his conduct of the war. He was by far the most able general involved and it was his policies, strategy, and tactics that brought success to Paraguayan arms. The editor has included a detached set of maps describing the military operations in the Chaco region. He has prefaced the text with a biographical sketch of the marshall who died in an airplane accident in 1940 while President of the republic. He has also included a large number of illustrations that are helpful to the reader. It is a well edited account of real value for the understanding of the Chaco War. (Edward J. McCarthy)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Les manuscrits du désert de Juda. Les "apercus" de M. Dupont-Sommer. G. Lambert, S.I., et G. Vermès (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Apr.).

La gnose de Clément d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la foi et la philosophie. Joseph Moingt (*Recherches de science religieuse*, Jan.).

Les origines et le sens de la formule: Cujus regio, ejus religio. Joseph Lecler (*ibid.*).

Les sources juives de la doctrine des anges des nations chez Origène. Jean Daniélou (*ibid.*).

De dignitate episcopali S. Cyrilli Thessalonicensis. S. Sakač, S.J. (*Orientalia christiana periodica*, Vol. XVI, Nos. III-IV, 1950).

Fuentes Palamiticas: Diálogo de Jorge Facrasi sobre el contradictorio de Pálamas con Nicéforo Grégoras. M. Candal, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Charakter der Sitzungen im Konzil von Florenz. G. Hofmann, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Controverse sur Hippolyte. P. Nautin, S. Giet. (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, Jan.).

L'église et le prêt à intérêt d'après un ouvrage inédit du début du XIX^{e} siècle. L. Bergasse (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Marriage Scenes in Roman and Early Christian Art. G. Bovini (*Folia*, Vol. V. Winter Issue, 1951).

Otloh, Eleventh Century Latinist. W. C. Korfmacher (*ibid.*).

A Prosopography of Bachiarius. F. X. Murphy (*ibid.*).

A Prosopography of Pope Damasus (II). M. A. Norton (*ibid.*).

Imagery of Sea and Ship in the Letters of St. Jerome. Leo M. Kaiser (*ibid.*).

Les plus anciennes prières liturgiques adressées à la Vierge en Occident. Louis Brou (*Hispania sacra*, July).

Aux origines de la liturgie gallicane. E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Jan.).

Significations et conditions de la contemplation dionysienne. René Roques (*ibid.*).

Histoire ecclésiastique du moyen âge (1re partie). Y. Renouard (*Revue historique*, Apr.).

Latin medieval (ensayo de orientación bibliográfica). Luis Vázquez de Parca (*Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos*, Jan.).

Les recherches historico-critiques et l'avenir de la scolastique. E. Gilson (*Antonianum*, Jan.).

Needed Research in Medieval Education. Francis X. Guindon (*Catholic Educational Rev.*, May).

Pro patria mori in Medieval Political Thought. Ernst H. Kantorowicz (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Utopien als Spiegel ihrer Zeit. P. Roth (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Apr.).

Byzantium and the Christian East. Christopher Dawson (*Dublin Rev.*, 1st quat., 1951).

Donoso Cortes *De Civitate Dei*. J. P. Mayer (*ibid.*).

La formación del cuerpo, según San Agustín. Lope Cilleruelo, O.S.A. (*La ciudad de Dios*, Sept.).

Wandalbert de Prüm e la date de la mort d'Hilduin de Saint-Denis. Léon Levillain (*Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, CVIII).

Soviet Theory of Social Development in the Early Middle Ages. Alexander Vucinich (*Speculum*, Apr.).

The Royal Serfs (*servi regales*) of the 'Ruthenian Law' and Their Origin. George Vernadsky (*ibid.*).

Raymond of Saint Gilles in Urban's Plan of Greek and Latin Friendship. John Hugh Hill (*ibid.*).

Economic Conditions in the County of Beaumont-le-Roger, 1261-1313. Joseph R. Strayer (*ibid.*).

Charlemagne's *De litteris colendis* and Alcuin—a Diplomatic-Historical Study. Luitpold Wallach (*ibid.*).

Historical Novels, 1949-1950. B. H. Whiting (*ibid.*).

Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles. E. Turdeanu (*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Oct.).

Des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux Beziehungen zu Trier. Nikolaus Zimmer (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift,* Jan. and Mar.).

La foi de Dante Alighieri dans la "Divine Comédie." Mario Ostan (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* Jan.).

Doctrina de San Vicente Ferrer sobre la naturaleza de la iglesia. Emilio Sauras, O.P. (*La ciencia tomista,* Oct.).

Nicolau de Cusa. Estudo dos quadros históricos em que se desenvolveu seu pensamento e análise dos livros I e II do "De Docta Ignorantia." Lívio Teixeira (*Revista de história,* Jan.).

Augusto Comte e as origens do positivismo. J. Cruz Costa (*ibid.*).

The Reform Activities of Denis the Carthusian (1402-1471). Richard H. Trame (*Histor. Bulletin,* Mar.).

La vie de Nicole de la Loge, abbé de Montier-la-Celle. Jean Godefroy (*Revue Mabillon,* Oct. and Jan.).

Un évêché en Asie Centrale au XIV^e^ siècle. V. Rondelez, C.I.C.M. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft—Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* 1951, Heft 1).

Das Christen-Verbot unter dem Tokugawa-Regime. Hubert Cieslik, S.J. (*ibid.*)

Brève histoire des lettres édifiantes et curieuses. André Rétif, S.J. (*ibid.*).

St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen. Romuald Simon, O.F.M.Cap. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research,* Apr.).

St. Lawrence of Brindisi and the Assumption Dogma: Assumption and Coronation of Mary. Earl Goeden, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

The Reign of Mary in Heaven. Noel Scanlon, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Paul of Cesena. Carmel Flora. O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).

First Capuchin Minister General, 1618-25. Ronald Jansch, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Laurentii de Cuyper, O.Carm., Doctrina de vita spirituali. P. Irenaeus Rosier, O.Carm. (*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum,* Vol. XV, Fasc. II).

Les Bollandistes. Raymond Poreye (*L'année théologique,* Fasc. 1, 1951).

L'insegnamento di Ludovico Antonio Muratori. Ezio Franceschini (*Aevum,* Jan.).

Storicismo e immanentismo in Benedetto Croce. G. Bortolaso, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica,* Feb.).

Fondamenti e sviluppi dello storicismo crociano. G. Bortolaso, S.I. (*ibid.,* Apr.).

The Meaning of History and Religion in Freud's Thought. Philip Rieff (*Jrn. of Religion,* Apr.).

A Defense of Atlantic Solidarity. Carlton J. H. Hayes (*Thought,* Spring, 1951).

Four Essays on the Relation of Political Theory to Research: The Decline of Modern Political Theory, David Easton; Political Theory and Public Administration, Donald W. Smithburg; Theory and Method in Voting Behavior Research, Samuel J. Eldersveld; The Process of Theory-Research Interaction, Alfred De Grazia (*Jrn. of Politics,* Feb.).

The Dignity of Facts. Griswold Morley (*P.M.L.A.*, Feb.).

The Basis of Literary History. Robert Herndon Fife (*ibid.*).

History and Criticism. W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. (*ibid.*).

The Role of Principles in Economics and Politics. F. H. Knight (*American Economic Rev.*, Mar.).

EUROPEAN

Unity in Europe: Further Reflection. John Murray (*Studies*, Mar.).

European Thought and the Unity of Europe. Julión Marías (*Dublin Rev.*, 3rd quart., 1950).

General Dumouriez and the Girondins, 1792-1793. Richard Munthe Brace (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Dom Simon Bougis, 7° Supérieur général de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur. G. Charvin (*Revue Mabillon*, Jan.).

O estado moderno e as grandes cidades do renascimento: A política de Antuérpia. Emile Coornaert (*Revista de história*, Jan.).

Machiavelli's Prince: Background and Formation. Eric Voegelin (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).

Pobedonostsev's Conception of the Good Society: An Analysis of His Thought after 1880. Robert F. Byrnes (*ibid.*).

Towards a Fourth Reich? The History of National Bolshevism in Germany. Klemens von Klemperer (*ibid.*).

New Views on Metternich. Peter Viereck (*ibid.*).

Auguste Davezac's Mission to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, 1833-1834. Howard R. Marraro (*Louisiana Histor. Quart.*, Oct., 1949).

Economic Conditions in Italy, 1918-1922. Gaetano Salvemini (*Jrn. of Modern Hist.*, Mar.).

Critical Note on the *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945*. Gerhard Weinberg (*ibid.*).

Monarcas navarros olvidados: Los Reyes de Viguera. Antonio Ubieto Arteta (*Hispania*, Jan.).

El maestre racional en la Corona de Aragón. Una pragmática de Juan II sobre dicho cargo. Angeles Masía de Ros (*ibid.*).

La organización de la Cancillería y el despacho de documentos durante las comunidades de Castilla. Filemón Arribas Arranz (*ibid.*).

Nuevos datos para la biografía de don Francisco Verdugo, capitán e historiador de las guerras de los Países Bajos. Antonio Rumeu de Armas (*ibid.*).

Tres actitudes ante el Portugal restaurado. José M.ª Jover (*ibid.*).

San Raimundo de Peñafort. Eloy Montero (*Revista de la Facultad de Derecho de Madrid*, No. 17, 1949).

Jacques Coeur et ses affaires aragonaises, catalanes et napolitaines. Constantin Marinesco (*Revue historique*, Apr.).

Les jansénistes italiens et la Constitution civile du clergé. Maurice Vaussard (*ibid.*).

Notas sobre los archivos de la bailía, la generalidad y la gobernación del reino de Valencia. Felipe Mateu y Llopis (*Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos*, Jan.).

Iglesias románicas de ladrillo de la provincia de Segovia. Octavio Gil Farrés (*ibid.*).

Las capillas del trascoro de la catedral de Segovia. M. Villalpando (*ibid.*).

Herencia medieval de Castilla. Luis Suárez Fernández (*Revista de estudios políticos*, Jan.).

El Monasterio de El Escorial, sus arquitectos y artífices. Luciano Rubio, O.S.A. (*La ciudad de Dios,* Sept.).

"Hizo San Ignacio en Montserrat o en Manresa vida solitaria." Pedro de Leturia, S.I. (*Hispania sacra,* July).

Don Nuño Pérez de Monroy, abad de Santander. Gervasio Velo y Nieto (*ibid.*).

Abades y priores de la iglesia de Santa María de Tudela. Francisco Fuentes (*ibid.*).

Un rótulo de Castilla de 1391. José Rius Serra (*ibid.*).

Notas diplomáticas sobre la iglesia de San Martín de Perrarúa. Ángel Canellas López (*ibid.*).

Manuscritos hispánicos en bibliotecas extranjeras. José Vives (*ibid.*).

Inventario de manuscritos de la catedral de Sigüenza. José Rius Serra y el Sr. Aurelio Federico Fernández (*ibid.*).

España en el "Testamento político" del Cardenal de Richelieu. Marcelin Defourneauz (*Clavileño,* Sept.).

La universidad en la literatura clásica española. William J. Entwistle (*ibid.,* Nov.).

Barcelona, unidad e imperio. Antonio Rumeu de Armas (*ibid.*).

El Arzobispo Eleta y el término de la causa de la Ven. María de Agreda. José María Pou y Martí, O.F.M. (*Archivo ibero-americano,* Oct.).

The First Year of the Bonn Government. James K. Pollock (*Jrn. of Politics,* Feb.).

The "Catholic Fraction." Clarence A. Herbst (*Histor. Bull.,* Mar.).

La chiesa e lo stato nel cerimoniale d'incoronazione degli ultimi sovrani Rurikidi. G. Olšr, S.J. (*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Vol. XVI, Nos. III-IV, 1950).

Moralistes de Russie. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J. (*ibid.*).

The Road from Tsar to Kaiser: Changing Loyalties of the Baltic Germans, 1905-1914. C. Leonard Lundin (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs,* Oct.).

The United States and the Dissolution of Austria-Hungary. Victor S. Mamatey (*ibid.*).

Pilsudski's Federal Policy, 1919-1921. M. K. Dziewanowski (*ibid.*).

Thirty Years of Soviet Literature. Mikhail Koriakov (*Thought,* Spring, 1951).

Die bolschewistische Pseudoreligion. Joseph Höffner (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift,* Mar.).

Sowjetpatriotismus. H. Falk (*Stimmen der Zeit,* Mar.).

Monte Cassino. G. Klenk (*ibid.*).

Rinascita della schiavitù [U.S.S.R.]. U. A. Floridi, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica,* Jan.).

Sviluppi della tattica comunista contro la chiesa cattolica in Cecoslovacchia. F. Cavilli, S.I. (*ibid.,* Mar.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Historismus in England. Duncan Forbes (*Cambridge Jrn.,* Apr.).

Arthur and the Roman-Celtic Frontier. J. C. Russell (*Modern Philology,* Feb.).

Constitutiones Capituli Londinensis Anni 1281. Ludovicus Saggi, O.Carm. (*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum,* Vol. XV, Fasc. II).

The Pardon Scene in *Piers Plowman.* Robert Worth Frank, Jr. (*Speculum,* Apr.).

Chaucer and the Goliards. James A. S. McPeek (*ibid.*).

Blessed Thomas Percey, 1528-1572. Thomas Harper (*Clergy Rev.,* Mar.).

Queen Elizabeth and the Portugal Expedition of 1589. I. R. B. Wernham (*English Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).

The Domesday Plough-Team. H. P. R. Finberg (*ibid.*).

John II, Bishop of Rochester. A. Saltman (*ibid.*).

Oboli de Musc'. Philip Grierson (*ibid.*).

The Texts of the Peace of Paris, 1259. I. J. Sanders (*ibid.*).

The Date of Roger Mortimer's Escape from the Tower of London. E. L. G. Stones (*ibid.*).

Obadiah Walker ou la ruine du catholicisme à Oxford. M. Nédoncelle (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, Apr.).

Les familiers du jeune Newman. Francis Hermans (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Jan.).

Irish Names in the Malines Ordination Registers, 1602-1749. (*Irish Eccl. Rec.*, Feb.).

The Home of St. Patrick. Liam S. Grogan (*ibid.*, Mar.).

St. Patrick's 'Breastplate'—A New Interpretation. Charles A. Bolton (*ibid.*).

Studies in the Liturgy of the Early Irish Church. John Hennig (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Thackeray in Ireland. B. C. MacCarthy (*Studies*, Mar.).

Sir John Howley (1789-1866). Francis Finegan (*ibid.*).

The Fixing of Rents by Agreement in Co. Galway, 1881-5. K. Buckley (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Mar.).

Land Owned by Catholics in Ireland in 1688. J. G. Simms (*ibid.*).

The Irish Parliamentary Party and the Liberals in Mid-Ulster, 1894. F. S. L. Lyons (*ibid.*).

Some Scottish Catholic Historians. Anthony Ross, O.P. (*Innes Rev.*, June, 1950).

French Influence on Scottish Catholic Education. James E. Handley (*ibid.*).

The Young Bishop Kyle. J. K. Robertson (*ibid.*).

Archbishop Wauchope. John Durkan (*ibid.*).

Sir David Lindsay, Reformer. Brother Kenneth (*ibid.*, Dec.).

Catholic Critics of George Buchanan. J. H. Burns (*ibid.*).

Scottish National Churches in Rome. David McRoberts (*ibid.*).

John Major: After 400 Years. J. Durkan (*ibid.*).

The School of John Major: Bibliography. J. Durkan (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

The Rise of American Intellectual History. John Higham (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

The *Roberts* Case: Source of the "Separate but Equal" Doctrine. Leonard W. Levy and Harlan B. Phillips (*ibid.*).

How Far Does the Constitution Separate Church and State? Lynford A. Lardner (*American Political Sciences Rev.*, Mar.).

The Negro in America. Daniel Lyons (*Studies*, Mar.).

Education in Colonial Louisiana. Stuart G. Noble (*Louisiana Histor. Quart.*, Oct., 1949).

La France et la Louisiane au début du XVIII[e] siècle. Marcel Giraud (*Revue historique*, Oct.).

Ebenezer Hazard's Travels through Maryland in 1777. Fred Shelley (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Mar.).

Catholicism in Philadelphia. Hugh L. Lamb (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Mar.).

Historical Progress of the Church in Philadelphia, 1875-1950. Norman MacNeil (*ibid.*).

The Catholic Philopatrian Literary Institute of Philadelphia, 1850-1950. Gerald P. O'Hara (*ibid.*).

The Church and the New York Draft Riots of 1863. Albon P. Man, Jr. (*ibid.*).

Imperial Episode [Iturbide]. Sr. Marie Aimee Savage (*ibid.*).

Lawlessness in Cairo, Illinois, 1848-1858. Harold E. Briggs (*Mid-America*, Apr.).

"Visiting Statesman" in Louisiana, 1876. Ralph J. Roske (*ibid.*).

Venezuelan Education during Liberation. John E. Baur (*ibid.*).

A Bancroft Library Manuscript of the 1858 Indian War. Ignatius Burns, S.J. (*Oregon Histor. Quart.*, Mar.).

The Menominee River. W. E. Schubert (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, Winter, 1950).

Trade Silver and Indian Silversmiths. David A. Baerreis (*ibid.*).

Cahensly's Plea for Protection of Emigrants. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Mar.).

The Abolition Movement in Minnesota. Frank Klement (*Minnesota Hist.*, Mar.).

The Benedictines in Frontier Minnesota. Vincent Tegeder (*ibid.*).

Jean Edouard Darveau, 1816-1844, First Martyr Priest among the Missionaries to the Indians in Western Canada. Alfred A. Sinnot (The Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report*, 1950).

Early Missions along Bay Chaleur. Charles J. Mersereau (*ibid.*).

Joseph Mathurin Bourg, First Acadian Priest. W. J. Osbourne (*ibid.*).

St. Michael's College—The Formative Years, 1850-1854. L. K. Shook, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Thomas O'Hagan, Pioneer Poet and Scholar. James T. Hurley (*ibid.*).

Mr. Justice White and the Rule of Reason. Robert B. Dishman (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).

The War Guilt Question and American Disillusionment, 1918-1928. Selig Adler (*Jrn. of Modern Hist.*, Mar.).

The Agricultural Issue in the Presidential Campaign of 1928. Gilbert C. Fite (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Mar.).

La personnalité missionnaire de la bienheureuse Marguerite Bourgeoys. Fernand Jetté, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Jan.).

D'Arcy McGee and Montreal. G. R. C. Keep (*Culture*, Mar.).

Le Québec et la guerre de 1812. Charles-M. Boissonnault (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, Mar.).

Papineau et le péril irlandais. Lionel Groulx (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Mar.).

External Determinants of the Canadian Upswing, 1921-9. Vernon W. Malach (*Canadian Jrn. of Economics and Political Science*, Feb.).

Two Contemporary Historians: José María Iglesias and Hubert Howe Bancroft. Frank A. Knapp, Jr. (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Feb.).

La historia de las ideas en Hispanoamérica. Leopoldo Zea (*Filosofía y letras*, Apr., 1950).

The Navaho during the Spanish Regime in New Mexico. Donald E. Worcester (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

A Coronado Episode. J. Wesley Huff (*ibid.*).

Old Settlers in Otero County. Dan McAllister (*ibid.*).

José Vasconcelos. Ronald Hilton (*The Americas*, Apr.).

Some Truths About Mexico. Fanchón Royer (*ibid.*).

The Library of the Apostolic College of San Fernando, Mexico, in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. Maynard Geiger (*ibid.*).

John A. Zahm, C.S.C.: Scientist and Americanist. Thomas F. O'Connor (*ibid.*).

Chile and Hispanic-American Solidarity, 1810-1830. Elliot A. Marcus (*ibid.*).

The Seminole in Mexico, 1850-1861. Kenneth W. Porter (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, Feb.).

The Recognition of Brazilian Independence. Alan K. Manchester (*ibid.*).

Early Price Lists in Lima and a Petition for Redress. John E. Longhurst (*ibid.*).

The Apocryphal Memoirs of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada. Frank A. Knapp, Jr. (*ibid.*).

Latin-American Archivology, 1949-1950. Roscoe R. Hill (*ibid.*).

Verdaderas causas de la expulsión de la Compañia de Jesús en tiempo de José Hilario López. Luis Forero Durán (*Revista Javeriana*, Mar.).

The Negro in the Exploration and Conquest of Peru. Noel Gray (*Primitive Man*, Jan.).

La leyenda negra hispanoamericana en la nueva historiografia alemana. Antón Rothbauer (*Clavileño*, Nov.).

San Francisco Solano en tierras germánicas. Nueva aportación bibliográfica. Gerold Fussenegger, O.F.M. (*Archivo ibero-americano*, Oct.).

O protestantismo brasileiro. Estudo de eclesiologia e de história social. Emile G. Léonard (*Revista de história*, Jan.).

Foreign Factors in Dictatorship in Latin America. John J. Johnson (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, May).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Aaron, Daniel. *Men of Good Hope. A Story of American Progressives.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. xiv, 329. $4.00.)

Alt, Vigilius, O.F.M.Cap. *De potestate magistri spiritus ad normam canonis 588.* (Rome: Catholic Book Agency. 1949. Pp. viii, 165.)

Angel, J. Lawrence. Troy. *The Human Remains.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati. 1951. Pp. 40. $7.50.) This is Supplementary Monograph I of a series that is planned to present technical studies of the material found in the University of Cincinnati's excavations at Troy. It is handsomely printed, contains a lengthy bibliography and a number of illustrations and charts. Here are treated the human bones which were studied during the summer of 1938 in the Archaeological Museum at Istanbul by Mr. Angel.

Annual Report of the John Carter Brown Library, 1949-1950 (Providence: John Carter Brown Library. 1950. Pp. 78.)

Ausubel, Herman (Ed.). *The Making of Modern Europe.* 2 books. (New York: Dryden Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 1183. Each book, $2.90.) This work contains eighty essays designed to accompany a standard textbook in modern European history. Chronologically the essays run from Joseph R. Strayer's "What is Medieval History?" to Kenneth Scott Latourette's "A Historian Looks Ahead: The Nature of Christianity in the Light of Its Past." The essays have been reprinted from nearly fifty periodicals including the *Catholic Historical Review, Studies,* and the *Review of Politics.* It is regrettable that these essays—many of which will provide very worthwhile reading assignments for students—should have been stripped of their accompanying footnotes in the present work.

Berve, Helmut. *Griechische Geschichte: Erste Hälfte: (Von den Anfangen bis Perikles) in zweiter verbesserter Auflage.* (Freiburg: Verlag Herder. 1951. Pp. 328. 15.80 DM.)

Blake, Nelson M., Harry Schwartz, Philip H. Taylor, W. Freeman Galpin, Sidney C. Sufrin, and Warren B. Walsh. Edited by Stuart Gerry Brown. *Great Issues. The Making of Current American Policy.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1950. Pp. viii, 578. $3.00.)

Bolivar, Simon. *Selected Writings of Bolivar.* Compiled by Vicente Lecuna and edited by Harold A. Bierck, Jr. Translated by Lewis Bertrand. 2 vols. (Caracas: Bank of Venezuela; New York: Colonial Press Inc. 1951. Pp. liii, 355; xiii, 467.)

Boxer, C. R. *The Christian Century in Japan: 1549-1650.* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1951. Pp. xv, 535. $7.50.)

Boyle, George. *Pioneer in Purple. The Biography of Neil McNeil.* (Montreal: Palm Publishers Press Services Ltd. 1951. Pp. xi, 290. $3.50.)

Broderick, S. J. *The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Union with England, 1829-1847.* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana. 1951. Pp. xxvii, 237. $2.50.)

Brown, Bernard Edward. *American Conservatives. The Political Thought of Francis Lieber and John W. Burgess.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1951. Pp. 191. $2.75.)

Calkin, Homer L. (Comp.). *Records of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.* (Washington: National Archives. 1951. Pp. vi, 156.)

Cammann, Schuyler. *Trade through the Himalayas. The Early British Attempts to Open Tibet.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. x, 186. $3.50.) This work gives an historical sketch of Tibet up to 1774 and then traces the activity of the British there up to 1782.

Canada, Public Archives of. *Descriptive Catalogue of a Collection of Water-Colour Drawings by Alfred Jacob Miller (1810-1874) in the Public Archives of Canada.* (Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier. 1951. Pp. 39.)

Crevenna, Theo. R. (Ed.) *Materiales para el Estudio de la clase media en la América Latina.* V. *La clase media en Costa Rica, Haiti y Venezuela.* (Washington: Pan American Union. 1951. Pp. xvi, 111. 30 centavos.)

Daniel, Walter. Edited by F. M. Powicke. *Life of Ailred, Abbot of Rievaulx.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. cii, 88. $3.50.)

Davies, E. T. *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century.* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1950. Pp. vi, 137. 10/6 net.)

De Grummond, Jane Lucas. *Envoy to Caracas. The Story of John G. A. Williamson, Nineteenth-Century Diplomat.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1951. Pp. xx, 228. $3.75.)

De Sion, Mère Madeleine Louise. *Physionomie d'une sainte: Jeanne de Chantal.* (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1950. Pp. 284. 350 Fr.)

Dessauer, Friedrich. *Am Rande der Dinge.* (Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht. 1951. Pp. 56. 2.80 DM.)

Farmer, Paul. *The European World. A Historical Introduction.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1951. Pp. xxvi, 618, xxv. $5.00.) Mr. Farmer of the University of Wisconsin here offers a new text for courses in the history of Western Civilization. The volume is well equipped with illustrations and maps.

Federal Records of World War II. 2 Vols. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office for the National Archives. 1950-1951. Pp. xii, 1073; iii, 1061. $2.50 each.) These volumes "are intended to serve as a guide to materials that will be useful for research, particularly in the planning and administration of national defense activities." The period covered by this work (which was first suggested by President Truman in 1946) is from 1939 to 1945. The subject-content of the records listed is indicated by a description of the organization and function of the principal agencies that contributed to the war effort. The bulk and whereabouts of these records, which are very often to be found outside the National Archives, are noted, although occasionally no information was available. Pertinent published material including administrative histories of war agencies are indicated throughout in this over-all guide to our national war records. The staff which produced these volumes under the supervision of Dr. Philip M. Hamer has produced a very successful guide to these records.

Fischer, Louis. *The Soviets in World Affairs, 1917-1929.* 2 Vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. xviii, 464; vii, 427. $10.00 for set.)

Fish, Sidney M. *Aaron Levy. Founder of Aaronsburg.* (New York: American Jewish Historical Society. 1951. Pp. ix, 81. $1.50.) This monograph on the founder of Aaronsburg, Centre County, Pennsylvania, is Number I of the Studies in American Jewish History of the American Jewish Historical Society. Mr. Fish teaches at Gratz College in Philadelphia.

Foreign Relations of the United States Diplomatic Papers, 1934. Vol. IV. *The American Republics.* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1951. Pp. lxv, 640. $2.75.) This newest addition to the series of which it is a part maintains the same high editorial care of previous volumes with a detailed list of the documents, the carefully edited texts, and a good index. The year 1934 embraced such items in United States' relations to Latin America as the Chaco dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay and the dispute over Leticia between Colombia and Peru.

Frost, James Arthur. *Life on the Upper Susquehanna, 1783-1860.* (New York: King's Crown Press. 1951. Pp. x, 172. $2.75.)

Gordon, Donald Craigie. *The Australian Frontier in New Guinea, 1870-1885.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1951. Pp. 301. $4.25.)

Halevy, Elie. *Victorian Years, 1841-1895.* (New York: Peter Smith. 1951. Pp. viii, 507. $6.00.) This reprint of the final volume of Halevy's famous history of England which he did not live to see completed contains a supplementary section by R. B. McCallum and incorporates Halevy's *Age of Peel and Cobden* which E. I. Watkin here translates from the French.

Hauser, Richard. *Autorität und Macht. Die staatliche Autorität in der neuen protestantischen Ethik und in der katholischen Gesellschaftslehre.* (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider. 1949. Pp. 431. 13.60 DM.)

Hester, Sister Mary, S.S.N.D. *Canticle for the Harvest.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1951. Pp. vii, 196. $2.75.)

Holborn, Hajo. *The Political Collapse of Europe.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc. 1951. Pp. xi, 212. Library edition $2.50; text edition $1.85.) Professor Holborn of Yale University here attempts an historical interpretation rather than an historical narrative of events of the forces working within Europe since the Congress of Vienna. The fact that the index does not so much as mention the Church or the name of any of the Popes since Pius VII would indicate that the historian of the Church or of Catholic Movements will find little here.

Hourani, George Fadlo. *Arab Seafaring in the Indian Ocean in Ancient and Early Medieval Times.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 131. $3.00.) This volume is Number 13 in the Princeton Oriental Studies edited by Professor Philip K. Hitti.

Hierarchy Centenary Congress, 1850-1950. The Story and Pictures of the Events in London, Sept. 25th to Oct. 1st, 1950. (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 1950. Pp. 64.) This is a very attractive brochure with a series of excellent pictures from the hierarchy centennial.

Jiménez de Aréchaga. Eduardo. *Voting and the Handling of Disputes in the Security Council.* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1951. Pp. 189. $2.00.)

Jones, Loch. *Democratic Mental Freedom. An Analysis of Organized Religion in Relation to the Needs and Potentialities of Modern Man.* (New York: William Frederick Press. 1950. Pp. 27. 50¢.)

Kane, Lucile M. (Trans.). *Military Life in Dakota. The Journal of Philippe Régis de Trobriand.* (St. Paul: Alvord Memorial Commission. 1951. Pp. xxv, 395. $7.50.)

Kilger, Laurenz, O.S.B. *Der einheimische Klerus in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* (Schöneck/Beckenried, Suisse: Administration der neuen Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. 1950. Pp. xx, 321. 18.- Sfr.)

Kirkland, Edward C. *A History of American Economic Life.* 3rd edition. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1951. Pp. xii, 740. $5.00.)

Knapp, Frank Averill, Jr. *The Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889. A Study of Influence and Obscurity.* University of Texas Institute of Latin-American Studies, XII. (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1951. Pp. ix, 292. $4.00.)

Knoles, George H. and Rixford K. Snyder (Eds.). *Readings in Western Civilization.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1951. Pp. xi, 896.)

Knowles, David. *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1951. Pp. vii, 190. $2.85.)

Krauskopf, Robert W. (Comp.). *Records of the United States War Ballot Commission.* No. 24. (Washington: National Archives. 1951. Pp. v, 4.)

Laistner, M. L. W. *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire, together with an English Translation of John Chrysostom's Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1951. Pp. vi, 145. $2.50.)

Lane, Raymond A., M.M. *The Early Days of Maryknoll.* (New York: David McKay Co. 1951. Pp. viii, 311. $3.00.)

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A Short History of the Far East.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1951. Pp. xiv, 730. $5.25.) Revised edition. This text by the Sterling professor of missions and oriental history at Yale gives more than the ordinary attention to the Christian Missions in the Far East. The author's treatment of the Catholic Missions is marked by the urbanity and fairness that have characterized all his writing on the Church. Professors of Far Eastern history will find this a sound and attractive text for their classes.

Lawler, Loretto R. *Full Circle. The Story of the National Catholic School of Social Service, 1918-1947.* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1951. Pp. ix, 243.)

Lietzmann, Hans. *A History of the Early Church.* Volume III. *From Constantine to Julian.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1950. Pp. 340. $5.50.)

List of File Microcopies of the National Archives. National Archives Publications No. 51-5. (Washington: General Services Administration. 1950. Pp. v, 67.)

Little, Katharine Day. *François de Fénelon. Study of a Personality.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1951. Pp. x, 273. $3.50.)

Lovasik, Lawrence G. S.V.D. *Stepping Stones to Sanctity. Practical Hints for Religious and Lay People.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1951. Pp. v, 151. $2.25.)

McGrath, Fergel. *Newman's University. Idea and Reality.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc. 1951. Pp. xv, 537. $7.00.)

Major, J. Russell. *The Estates General of 1560.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 146. $2.50.)

Maritain, Jacques. *Man and the State.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1951. Pp. x, 219. $3.50.)

Martini, Guiseppe. *Cattolicismo e storicismo. Momenti d'una crisi del pensiero religioso moderno.* (Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane. 1951. Pp. xxix, 357. prezzo lire milletrecento.)

Mason, Kathryn Harrod. *James Harrod of Kentucky.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1951. Pp. xxii, 266. $4.00.)

Maynard, Theodore. *Through My Gift. The Life of Mother Frances Schervier.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1951. Pp. 318. $3.50.)

Miniatures of the Renaissance. Fifth Centenary of the Vatican Library. (Vatican City: The Apostolic Vatican Library. 1950. Pp. 96, xxxi plates.) This brochure is a catalogue of the Exhibition with two reproductions in color and thirty-one in black.

Mirot, Albert. *Manuel de géographie historique de la France.* Vol. II. *Les Divisions religieuses et administratives de la France.* (Paris: Editions A. et J. Picard et Cie. 1950. Pp. 309-619. 800 Francs.) The first volume had given the political aspect of French historical geography; this one traces the ecclesiastical boundaries from Merovingian times up to the present, and gives the administrative, juridical, fiscal, and educational divisions in their historical development. With sixteen maps and complete indices, it is indispensable for reference.

Monks, James L., S.J. *Great Catholic Festivals.* (New York: Henry Schuman, Inc. 1951. Pp. 110. $2.50.) Father Monks, who has been professor of dogmatic theology, liturgy, and oriental theology at Weston College since 1939, here discusses six of the leading Catholic feasts is as many brief chapters.

Morency, Robert, S.J. *L'union de grâce selon saint Thomas.* Studia Collegii Maximi Immaculatae Conceptionis VIII. (Montreal: Collection des Studia. 1950. Pp. 287. $3.00.)

Morison, Elting E. (Ed.). *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt. The Years of Preparation, 1868-1900.* 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1951. Pp. xxix, 800; vi, 748. $20.00 for set.)

Neill, Thomas P. *They Lived the Faith.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1951. Pp. x, 388. $4.00.)

Notes for Revolution. A Tool for Basic Education. (New York: William-Frederick Press. 1951. Pp. 25. Single copy free. In quantity 25¢ each.)

Oesterreicher, John M. *Seeds of Hope.* (St. Louis: Pio Decimo Press. 1950. Pp. 68. $1.25.) This volume is a series of five sermons on the mystery of Israel by a Jewish convert-priest of the Archdiocese of New York.

Ogg, Frederic A. and P. Orman Ray. *Introduction to American Government.* 10th edition. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1951. Pp. viii, 1063. $5.50.)

Olson, Martin O. *World Peace Ideology. A Detailed Program for a Compulsory World Government.* (New York: William-Frederick Press. 1951. Pp. 27. 50¢.)

Otis, R. R. (Comp.). *French Intrusion into Spain's La Florida.* 2nd issue. (Atlanta: by author at 51 Peachtree Way. 1951. Pp. 28.)

Palickar, Rev. Stephen J. *Joseph Murgas, Priest Scientist: His Musical Wireless Telegraphy and the First Radio.* (Sunland, Calif.: Cecil L. Anderson; New York: by author at 632 West End Ave. 1950. Pp. xv, 164. $5.00.)

Pastor, Ludwig Freiherr von. *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages.* Vol. XXXVI. *Benedict XIV (1740-1758) Clement XIII (1758-1769);* Vol. XXXVII. *Clement XIII (1758-1769).* Translated by E. F. Peeler. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1950. Pp. xii, 513; xii, 458. $5.00 each.)

Proceedings of the First Congress of Historians from Mexico and the United States Assembled in Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico, September 4-9, 1949. (Mexico: Editorial Cultura, T. G., S. A. 1950. Pp. 420.)

Rael, Juan B. *The New Mexican 'Alabado.'* With transcription of music by Eleanor Hague. Stanford University Publications University Series, Language and Literature, Vol. IX, No. 3. (Stanford: Stanford University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press. 1951. Pp. 154. $2.50.)

Renoirte. Fernand. *Cosmology. Elements of a Critique of the Sciences and of Cosmology.* The Philosophical Series of the Higher Institute of Philosophy, University of Louvain, Belgium, Vol. V. Translated by James F. Coffey. (London: B. Herder; New York: Joseph F. Wagner Inc. 1950. Pp. xv, 256. $3.50.)

Restrepo, R. P. Félix, S.I. *Estudios de filología e historia literaria.* Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, Vol. V, 1949. (Bogotá: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo. 1950. Pp. xii, 581.)

Robinson, Charles Alexander, Jr. *Ancient History, from Prehistoric Times to the Death of Justinian.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1951. Pp. xxiii, 738. $6.00.)